	0010529
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6001 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:13:21
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6002 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:13:21 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
Correspondence:	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6003 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:13:21 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resourc

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6004 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:13:21 Web Form							
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to							
	me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be							
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.							
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6005 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:13:21							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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: Name: Received:	6006 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:13:21							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a							
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan							
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name:	6007 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Received:	May,07,2010 08:13:29							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:							
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding.							

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

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

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

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

6008 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
May,07,2010 08:13:29
Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan
are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
6009 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:13:29 Web Form
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
6010 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:13:29 Web Form
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6011 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:13:29
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6012 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:13:29 Web Form 1 appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and mildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the best scientific information. Wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6013 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:13:37 Velocities V

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6014 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 08:13:37 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t 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 chone or schound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6015 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:13:38 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6016 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Work Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative 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.

	0010534
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6017 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:13:38 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the elternative plane precented in the draft environmental impact statement. Learners the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID: Name:	6018 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 08:13:38 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 they provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more ba
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6019 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:13:38 Web Form I I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

	0010535
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6020 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:13:46 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID:	6021 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 08:13:46 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	 and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6022 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May.07,2010 08:13:46 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degrad

	0010550
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6023 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 S, J May,07,2010 08:19:13 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6024 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:19:51 Web Form 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 neglegible 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 propery owner, visitor and concerned tax payer.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6025 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:22:58 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6026 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:30:06 Web Form 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 recommend
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6027 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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

0010537								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Forn As a long intended maintaini conseque stewardsl appeal to experience and respo badly flar For the re-	g time conserv by the origina ing a conserva ences. One poi hip of a fragile o those who sta ce is that the v onsibility navi wed and if cor est of my com- ble ORV plan	I enabling le tionist appro- nt that has n habitat to c y there to un ast majority gate the beau rected woul- nents I wou which addre	egislation. I find the bach. NPS alternate ot been emphasized ur family member inderstand the frag of people who statch in their ORVs. d support a quite of ld defer to the stat sses all interests in	32596 ty owner I ar ne position of ive F is badl, ed is that this rs. While we ile nature of the the would app different conc thement of the n a balanced	Private: a also a strong the Coalition t y flawed in add natural habitat do rent out our he area and to ie in this paradi ear that a large clusion. Coalition whic manner.	o be very ppting Drad has provid property f treat it acc ise treat the amount of ch has wor	t of recreational use of the Hatteras National Seashore as reasonable and responsible in addressing all interests while conian measures with minimal benefit and enormous de me and my family an opportunity to teach responsible for a limited season, we leave documentation in our home to cordingly. We suggest guidelines to accomplish this end. My e surroundings with respect, including those who carefully f the data that have been cited to support Alternative F are ck diligently to develop a well reasoned approach to a man stakeholders, but also the wonderful array of natural
Correspondence ID: Name:	Thanks y	A. Kniffen Project:	10641	Document:	32596			

Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Meyer, Matthew May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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: Name: Received:	6030 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:40:22 Y								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for								
Common and an an ID	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6031 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:40:22 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a								

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

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

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

Correspondence ID:	6038 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6037 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:40:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and dwildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife includuing breeding, migrati						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6036 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 08:40:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at paproach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred pl						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form 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 plan yould provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to pr						
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00						

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

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

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

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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 breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6039 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 08:40:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underprin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need mo
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6040 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 08:40:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative plan would provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Re
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6041 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:40:32 Web Form I I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

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

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

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

Correspondence ID.	6045 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6045 Project: 10641 Document: 32396 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:40:38
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID: Name:	6046 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 08:40:38 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its rece
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6047 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:40:43 V
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form 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 them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones f
Correspondence ID:	6048 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y

 Correspondence ID:
 6048
 Project:
 10641
 Document:
 32596
 Private:
 Y

 Name:
 private
 Secondary
 May,07,010 08:40:43
 Secondary
 Second

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6049 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:40:43
Received:May,07,2010 08:40:43Correspondence Type: Correspondence:Web FormI appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater peor was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibite 	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6050 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:40:43 Web Form I Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, a
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6051 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:40:48 Web Form I I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y rivate day,07,2010 08:40:48 /eb Form appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the tternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which as identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the acches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. he following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: rovide Equal Access for AII Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 6 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at cast half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this poproach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a hance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. ut Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent ith this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, nd wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are inimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. stablish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	053 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y rivate fay.07,2010 08:40:49 /eb Form appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the tternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which as identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the eaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. he following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: rovide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 6 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at tast half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could hem more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a hance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. ut Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should ore wildlife including breeding, migrating, nd wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are inimumus and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. stablish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are hanagement targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife and on its recent egraded abilities. Where birds, turtle
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	054 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y rivate 1ay,07,2010 08:40:49 /eb Form appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the tternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which as identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the eaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. he following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: rovide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 6 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at east half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this pproach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a hance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. ut Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent ith this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, ad wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are inimiums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. stablish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and mil

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6055 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:40:49 Via Formation Y
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID:	6056 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 08:40:49 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and awildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife rather real plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be impl
Correspondence ID:	6057 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 08:40:54
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be impremented until peakers?
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6058 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:40:54 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6059 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:40:54
Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protectiv
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6060 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 08:40:54 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors: Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6061 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 08:40:54 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and winter

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6062 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:00
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6063 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife inclouing migrating, and wint
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6064 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:00
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to proteet breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID:	6065 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y

Received: May,07,20 Correspondence Type: Web Form Correspondence: I appreciato

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6066 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:00 Web Form 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, 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 is meaning. Protection of theses
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6067 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 08:41:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative plan would provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for no-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the prefered plan are minimums and should be increased if necess
Correspondence ID: Name:	6068 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private

 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6069 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:06 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D. Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and sho
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6070 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:06 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors: Predestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, a
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6071 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:06 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6072 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:000 Web Form 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 environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Autarual Resources First: Pro
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6073 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:06 Web Form 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
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6074 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 08:41:06 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative D if modified to provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Rec

Common and an an ID:	6075 Duringte 10641 Decomments 20506 Durington V
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6075 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:11
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as
Correspondence ID:	6076 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 08:41:12 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goal
Correspondence ID:	6077 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 08:41:12
Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6078 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:12 Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6079 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:12							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 08:41:12 Web Form 1 appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its rece							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6080 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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. Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all vistors. Pedestrians and families could then more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all vistors. Pedestrians and families could then more walkways and better access facilitites, which are chance to rebound to its traditional numbe							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6081 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:17 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a							

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Pagaiyad:	6085 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:18
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 08:41:18 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must includue clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective me
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6086 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 08:41:18 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protectio
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6087 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07.2010 08:41:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative plan would provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and families could then more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors: Pedetrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if nececovery: A plan must inclu
Correspondence ID:	6088 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y

6088 I	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y				
private										
May,07,201	10 08:41:23									
Web Form										
I appreciate	e the opportun	ity to comm	ent on National P	ark Service's	s proposed plan	to manage	ORV use on Ca	ape Hatteras Na	tional Seashore.	Of the
alternative p	plans presente	ed in the dra	ft environmental i	impact stater	nent, I support	Alternative	D if modified to	o provide greate	er pedestrian acce	ess, which
was identifi	ied in the DEl	S as the env	vironmentally pref	erred alterna	tive. This alter	native plan	would provide i	nore opportunit	ty for non-ORV u	ises of the
	private May,07,20 Web Form I appreciate alternative	private May,07,2010 08:41:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportun alternative plans presente	private May,07,2010 08:41:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comm alternative plans presented in the dra	private May,07,2010 08:41:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National P alternative plans presented in the draft environmental i	private May,07,2010 08:41:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact stater	private May,07,2010 08:41:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support	private May,07,2010 08:41:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative	private May,07,2010 08:41:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Ca alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to	private May,07,2010 08:41:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras Na alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide great	private May,07,2010 08:41:23

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6089 Pr private May,07,2010	0)641 I	Document:	32596	Private:	Y	
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	alternative pla was identified beaches and re The following Provide Equal 16 of the 68 to least half of th approach wou chance to rebo Put Natural Re with this prote and wintering minimums and Establish and management t degraded abili	ns presented in in the DEIS a esult in less dis principals sho Access for Al tal miles of Sc e beach should ld provide bala ound to its trad esources First: ection. The pre species. Wildl d should be ind Meet Clear Go argets in the D ties. Where bi until recovery	n the draft of s the enviro sturbance o ould underp ll Visitors: eashore bea d be availat anced acces litional num Protection ferred plan life protecti creased if n oals for Will DEIS, they r rds, turtles	environmental i onmentally pref f wildlife, whice in the park's fo Under the Natio (ch. This does n ble year round f ss for all visitor abers and divers of the natural r fails to set asice ion must be bas ecessary to pro ddlife Recovery eeed more thore and plants are r	impact state ferred altern thare impor rmulation o oonal Park Se for non-OR' s. Pedestriat sity within t resources an de adequate tect breedin : A plan mu ough vetting not coming	ment, I support ative. This alter tant to me. f its final plan, ervice's preferer a fair balance V users and will as and families he park. d wildlife of th areas that are f est scientific im g birds and sea ast include clean based on the p back as planned	Alternative rnative plar should it ne ed plan, Alt for other us dlife. Coml could then e Seashore ree of ORV formation. Y turtles. r goals and potential of d, based on	e ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the e D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which a would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the ot choose to enact Alternative D: emative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only sers and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at bined with more walkways and better access facilities, this more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a should come first, and recreational use should be consistent use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent annual reviews, additional protective measures should be them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 (Web Form People are ma consider the fo I appreciate th alternative pla was identified beaches and re The following Provide Equal 16 of the 68 to least half of th approach wou chance to rebo Put Natural Re with this prote and wintering minimums and Establish and management t degraded abili	08:41:23 jor contributor ollowing sugge e opportunity ns presented in in the DEIS a esult in less dis principals she Access for Al otal miles of Se te beach should le provide bala ound to its trad esources First: extion. The pre species. Wildl d should be ince Meet Clear Ge argets in the D ties. Where bi until recovery	rs to the dea estions for a to commen n the draft of sturbance o ould underp Il Visitors: eashore bea eashore bea to be availab anced acces litional num Protection ferred plan life protecti creased if n oals for Wil DEIS, they r rds, turtles	reform. It on National P environmental i onmentally pref f wildlife, whice in the park's fo Under the Nation ch. This does n ble year round f ss for all visitor bers and divers of the natural r fails to set asid ion must be bas ecessary to pro dlife Recovery eed more thore and plants are n	Park Service impact state ferred altern that impor rmulation o onal Park Se ot represent for non-OR s. Pedestria sity within t resources an le adequate ed on the be tect breedin : A plan mu ough vetting not coming	s proposed pla ment, I support ative. This alte tant to me. f its final plan, ervice's preferra a fair balance V users and will as and families he park. d wildlife of th areas that are f est scientific ini g birds and sea st include clean based on the p back as planned	n to managg Alternative rnative plar should it no ed plan, Alt for other us dlife. Coml could then e Seashore ree of ORV formation. V turtles. r goals and obtential of d, based on	safety of the sea turtles and act as their voice. Please e ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the e D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which a would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the ot choose to enact Alternative D: ernative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only sers and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at bined with more walkways and better access facilities, this more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a should come first, and recreational use should be consistent use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent annual reviews, additional protective measures should be them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 Web Form I appreciate th alternative pla was identified beaches and ra The following Provide Equal 16 of the 68 to least half of th approach wou	08:41:23 e opportunity ns presented i in the DEIS a esult in less dis principals sho Access for Al tal miles of Se be beach should ld provide bala	to commen n the draft of sturbance o vuld underp II Visitors: eashore bea d be availal anced acces	environmental i onmentally pref f wildlife, whic vin the park's fo Under the Natio uch. This does no ble year round f	impact state ferred altern ch are impor rmulation o onal Park Se not represent for non-OR ^V s. Pedestria	ment, I support ative. This alte tant to me. f its final plan, ervice's preferra a fair balance V users and will as and families	Alternative rnative plar should it no ed plan, Alt for other us dlife. Com	e ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the e D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which a would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the ot choose to enact Alternative D: ernative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only sers and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at bined with more walkways and better access facilities, this more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6092 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the baeches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and p
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6093 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, an
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6094 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May.07,2010 08:41:30 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORV's would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors: Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, a

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6095 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:30								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate manag								
Correspondence ID:	6096 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y								
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 08:41:30 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the								
	beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.								
Correspondence ID:	6097 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y								
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 08:41:30 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the								
	beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6098 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:30 Web Form								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the								

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Paggiyad:	6099 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May 07 2010 08:41:30								
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 08:41:30 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its rece								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6100 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:30 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore buffer in the preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to prote								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6101 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:35 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are								

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6102 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:35
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned,
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6103 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 08:41:35 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include cl
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6104 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 08:41:35 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for no-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6105 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y

Name:

private

Received:May,07,2010 00:00:00Correspondence:Web FormCorrespondence:As a tax payer and natu

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: Name: Received:	private	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y			
Correspondence Type:	Web Form									
Correspondence:			opreciate the	e multi-use logic	but please	take a stand to r	reserve the wildness and wild life I'm 72 and am thinking o	of the		
	heritage lef	t to later ger	nerations. K	nowing these prot	ected areas e	xist is as great	satisfaction as using them.			
	I appreciate	e the opportu	unity to com	ment on National	Park Service	e's proposed pla	n to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. C	Of the		
	alternative	plans presen	nted in the d	raft environmenta	l impact state	ement, I suppor	Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian acces	ss, which		
	was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the									
	beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.									
	The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:									
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only									
		16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at								
	least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this									
	approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a									
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.									
	Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent									
	with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating,									
	and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are									
	minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.									
							goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are			
							otential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its			
	U			*	Ű	*	l, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures sh			
			overy goals a	re met. These goa	us, and adeq	uate manageme	t to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering spec	cies as well		
	as breeding	g ones.								

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Forn I apprecia alternative was identi	te the opportu e plans presen fied in the DE	ted in the di EIS as the er	aft environmental	l impact state eferred altern	ment, I support ative. This alte	Y an to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the t Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, whi ernative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of t	
	The follow Provide E 16 of the 0 least half of chance to Put Natura with this p and winte minimum Establish managem degraded	ving principal qual Access for 58 total miles of the beach si would provide rebound to its al Resources I protection. The ring species. V is and should be and Meet Clea- ent targets in the abilities. Whe ted until recov	s should un or All Visite of Seashore hould be av e balanced a traditional First: Protect e preferred f Wildlife pro be increased ar Goals for the DEIS, th re birds, tur	ors: Under the Nat beach. This does ailable year round access for all visito numbers and dive tion of the natural plan fails to set as tection must be ba if necessary to pr Wildlife Recover ney need more tho tles and plants are	ormulation o tional Park So not represen I for non-OR for non-OR resources an ide adequate ased on the bio otect breedin y: A plan mu rough vetting not coming	f its final plan, ervice's preferra t a fair balance V users and will ns and families he park. Id wildlife of th areas that are f est scientific in g birds and sea st include clean g based on the p back as planned	should it not choose to enact Alternative D: red plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl of or other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, Idlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, th s could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consist free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migratin formation. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are a turtles. It goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent d, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be for migrating and wintering species as w	at at is e a tent ng,
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Forn	-	10641 nity to com	Document:	32596 Park Service	Private: 's proposed pla	Y an to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the	

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6109 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental preferred alternative. This alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D. Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at paproach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more th
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6110 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 08:41:42 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore build for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and sho
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6111 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:41:47 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6112 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:43:07 Web Form
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6113 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
correspondence.	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian 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 parks 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 goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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: Name:	6114 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May 07 2010 08:43:14
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 08:43:14 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this opproved hundle beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this opproved hundle beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Seashore or and wildlife acced hundle beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and swild then were seen to a seashore access facilities, this
	approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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 OUOR LIFE CYCLE. WITHOUT BIODIVERSITY WE ARE ALSO DOOMED TO EXTINCTION.

Correspondence ID:	6115 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 08:43:14 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Comesnondones ID:	6116 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Correspondence ID: Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 08:43:14 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Correspondence ID: Name:	6117 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 private May,07,2010 08:43:14 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6118 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:43:15
	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
	· · ·
Correspondence ID: Name:	6119 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 08:43:15
Correspondence Type:	Web Form Langrangiate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Sarvice's proposed plan to manage OPV use on Cape Hattares National Sasshere. Of the
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following t
Correspondence ID:	6120 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 08:43:15 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:	6121 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 08:43:21
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide groups production access
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more valkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rare minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural r
Correspondence ID:	6122 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 08:43:32 Web Form 1 appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abiliti
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6123 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:43:32 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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: Name: Received:	6124 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:43:32
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6125 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 08:43:32 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be include the bird where birds turtles are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be include the bird where birds turtles are not coming back as planned.
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6126 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:43:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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: Name: Received:	6127 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:43:33 Wab Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6128 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 08:43:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6129 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:43:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	 It is inconceivable to me that there is any doubt about using the alternative plan. This alternative plan 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 Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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. Human irresponsibility has got to stop. Stop it here and now.

Correspondence ID: Name:	6130 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 08:43:48 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private 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: Name: Received:	6132 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:43:48
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 08:43:54 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resourc
Correspondence ID:	6134 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private 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. * Excluding the followed by the followed by the protection of the protectin of the p
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6135 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:43:54
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6136 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07.2010 08:43:55
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 08:43:55 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife racher than on its recen
Correspondence ID:	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 6137 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 08:43:55 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6138 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:44:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at paproach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to prote

* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are net. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6139 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May.07,2010 08:44:00 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Correspondence ID:	6140 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 08:44:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife factovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additio
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6141 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 08:45:12
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6142 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Anderson, Peter N May,07,2010 08:52:34 Web Form 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 curf fishing locations on the accessible only by ORY.
	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: Name: Received:	6143 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:22 Web Form
Correspondence: 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 recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtle
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6144 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May.07,2010 09:10:22 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore buildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimumus and should be increased if necessary to pr
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6145 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 09:10:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include cl

	0010573
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6146 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife racher than on its recent management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildl
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	as breeding ones. 6147 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental marks formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual review, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate managemen
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6148 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 09:10:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore build for which is increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather t
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6149 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:25 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6150 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:28
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should corem first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent d
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6151 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 09:10:28 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore buildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be in
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6152 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:28 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, an

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

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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 Wob Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form 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 or 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 ar 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 on 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 environmental impact statement to rue. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should in to choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV us
Correspondence ID:	6154 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received:	May,07,2010 09:10:28
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of th beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consiste with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate managemen
Correspondence ID:	6155 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:10:29 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6156 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:34
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife of the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them,
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6157 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:34
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are man
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6158 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:34
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the
Correspondence ID: Name:	6159 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y

Name:

private

Correspondence:

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6160 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:39 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative P opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches for Sashore beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D. Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beaches and divisitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore bould be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6161 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:40 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including bree
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6162 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:45 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

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

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

Correspondence ID:	6163 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Correspondence TD: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Biology Project: 10041 Document: 32.590 Private: 1 May,07,2010 09:10:45 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental impact statement, I support Alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and failies could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective meas
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6164 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 09:10:45 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should for midfied including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if nec
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6165 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:45 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6166 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:May,07,2010 00:00:00Correspondence Type: Correspondence:Web FormI appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras Nat Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opp 	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6167 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:50 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are fere of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include cl
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6168 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 09:10:50 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be probibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wi
Correspondence ID: Name:	6169 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private

 Name:
 private

 Received:
 May,07,2010 09:10:50

 Correspondence:
 Veb Form

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

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6170 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form 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 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6171 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:51 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan mus
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6172 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:51 Web Form 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

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

Correspondence ID:	6173 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 09:10:56 Web Form
Correspondence:Web FormI appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras Na alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide great was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportuni beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be pro 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreation with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife incl and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in t 	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6174 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:56
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID: Name:	6175 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife netored plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ractory. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented

	0010302
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6176 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:10:56 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goa
Correspondence ID:	6177 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	May,07,2010 09:10:56
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at part of the beaches should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wil
Correspondence ID:	6178 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:10:56
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented un
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6179 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:11:01 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6180 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:11:02
CorrespondenceWeb FormRegarding National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and a disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited 1 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better a approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wi chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including b and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the prefer 	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6181 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07.2010 09:11:02 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underprin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migratin
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6182 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 09:11:02 Web Form I I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species.

Correspondence ID:	6183 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Web Form I have spent many days vacationing on North Carolina's barrier islands, including the Cape Hatteras National Seashore on t family there and spend our tourist dollars to enjoy outdoor recreation and wildlife such as sea turtles and shorebirds. Theref opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian acc the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative I Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be pro- 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreation and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife degraded abilities. Where birds, tur	
Correspondence ID:	6184 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:11:12
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not
Correspondence ID: Name:	6185 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:11:14 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its rece

	0010585
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6186 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:11:16 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative D if modified to provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D. Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore build for wildlife necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones f
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6187 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 09:11:19 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set asile adequate areas that are fere of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6188 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:11:21 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistemi with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, an
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6189 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6190 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 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. Is 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 choses 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 wildl
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6191 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 09:11:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and dividities could hem more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews,
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6192 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:11:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6196 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:11:40
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6197 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 09:11:40 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6198 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 09:11:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should for wildling including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if
Correspondence ID:	6199 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y

Correspondence ID:	0199	rroject:	10041	Document:	52590	rnvate
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2	010 09:11:41				
Correspondence Type:	Web For	n				

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

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

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

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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 breeding ones.
 alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide grew was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportube acches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be p 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways an approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashor chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreat with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife in and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recover management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlide adbilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional provide adbilities. 	private May,07,2010 09:11:46 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6201 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 09:11:46 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative plan would provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6202 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative 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.

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6203 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:11:46 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and pla
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6204 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:11:46 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Correspondence ID:	6205 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:11:46
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
	6206 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y

Correspondence ID:6206Project:10641Document:32596Private:YName:private

Correspondence:

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6207 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:11:51 Web Form I I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating,
	and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6208 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:11:51 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D. Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones to
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6209 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:11:51 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

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

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

Correspondence Dr	6210 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Correspondence ID: Name:	6210 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 09:11:51
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife reatorey. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degrad
Correspondence ID: Name:	as breeding ones. 6211 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 09:11:57 Wab Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wil
Correspondence ID:	6212 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:11:57 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6213 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:11:57
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on nanual reviews, additiona
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6214 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 09:11:57 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set asile adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, an
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6215 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 09:12:02 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must i
Correspondence ID: Name:	6216 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private

 Name:
 private

 Received:
 May,07,2010 09:12:02

 Correspondence:
 Veb Form

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

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6217 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:12:02
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6218 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:10 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife protect muse based on the best scientific information. Wildlife frecovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6219 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:10 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:13:10 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources
Correspondence ID:	6221 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:13:10
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be imple
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6222 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:10
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6223 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form					
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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.					
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be					
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.					
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.					
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6224 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:10					
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.					
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.					
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be compared using the part of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be compared using the part of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be compared using the part of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be compared using the part of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first.					
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are					
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.					
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.					
Correspondence ID: Name:	6225 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private					
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:13:17 Web Form					
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This 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 following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6226 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:17 Web Form					
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.					
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.					
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be					
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent					
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.					
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6227 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:17 Web Form					
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to					
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.					
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.					
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well					
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6228 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:17 Y					
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.					

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6229 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:17 Web Form					
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.					
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.					
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be					
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set as ide adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent					
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.					
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6230 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:17 Web Form					
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to					
	me.					
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this preferred plan foils to set acide adequate areas that are fee of ORV use aver round for wildlife including breading.					
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.					
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we					
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6231 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:17					
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.					
	This 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 following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6232 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:17 Wob Form					
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.					
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.					
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be					
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.					
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6233 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:17 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.					
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.					
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:13:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the					
correspondence.	alternative plan spresented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me					

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6235 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:13:27
	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6237 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:27 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this
	approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6238 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:27
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID:	6239 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:13:27
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ratter than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize th
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6240 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6241 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:27
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6242 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:27
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6243 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:32 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6244 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:32 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6245 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private: May,07,2010 09:13:32 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the best scientific information. Wildlife interthan on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not comin
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6246 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:32 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breedin

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6247 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:32 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6248 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:33 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6249 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:39 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6250 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:39 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6251 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 6251 May,07,2010 09:13:39 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plans would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be invisitifie protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife inteuding breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protector musus the based on the best scientific information
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6252 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:39 Web Form I I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6253 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:39 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6254 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:39
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a be control the part of the prime of the prime of the prime of the part of the p
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6255 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:39
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at
	least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6256 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:39 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	 provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the pro
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6257 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:47 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals are whore upproved to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establis
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6258 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:47 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6259 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:47 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6260 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:47 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife feature than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migratin
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6261 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:47 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6262 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:13:47 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rater than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6263 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:55
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6264 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:56 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6265 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:56
Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6266 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:13:58 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
e en esperante en este en este este este este este	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breaching 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6267 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:01 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6268 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:01
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where bi
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6269 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to robound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife rotectory. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on nual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6270 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:01 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6271 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:01
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred pla are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as w as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be fol
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6272 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:01 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and mildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding.
	 consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are nee of OKV use year found for whithin including breeding migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred pla area minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as w as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6273 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:01 Web Form
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6274 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May 07 2010 09:14:01							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:14:01 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, and least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as w as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the nat							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6275 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:07 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred pla are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as w as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6276 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:07 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important							
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6277 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:07 Web Former								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6278 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:07 Web Form I Internative plans presented in the draft environment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.								
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6279 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:07 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important								
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.								

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6280 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y								
Received:	May,07,2010 09:14:07								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Way,07,2010 09:14:07 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the								
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.								
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred pla are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as w as breeding ones.								
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private May 07 2010 09:14:07								
Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:14:07 Web Form								
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the								
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to								
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								
	me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.								
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan								
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as w								
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.								
Correspondence ID: Name:	6282 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private								
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:14:13 Web Form								
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access.								
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl								

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6283 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private						
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 private May,07,2010 09:14:13 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 6284 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 09:14:13 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. "The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with his protection. The preferred plan fail						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6285 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:13 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.						

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	private May,07,20	Project: 10 09:14:13	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y		
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								
	*Provide E 16 of the 6 least half o approach v chance to r * Put Natu consistent migrating, are minimu * Establish manageme degraded a implement as breeding Thank you	equal Access 8 total miles 6 total miles 8 total miles 6 the beach slovould provide ebound to its and ebound to its and wintering ums and shou and Meet Cl nt targets in t bilities. Where duntil recover gones.	for All Visi of Seashore nould be av. balanced a traditional First. Prote ection. The g species. W ld be increased ear Goals for he DEIS, the revery goals a trunity to pr	tors. Under the Na beach. This does ailable year round access for all visito numbers and dive ection of the natur- preferred plan fai vildlife protection used if necessary to or Wildlife Recov- tey need more thou tles, and plants are re met. These goal	ational Park a not represen for non-OR rs. Pedestria rrsity within t al resources ls to set asid must be base o protect bre- ery. A plan r rough vetting e not coming ls, and adequ	Service's prefer t a fair balance V users and wil ns and families he park. and wildlife of e adequate area ed on the best s eding birds and nust include cle g based on the p back as planne ate management	red plan, <i>a</i> for other of dilife. Correctly could the Seash is that are cientific in sea turtle ar goals a potential or ed, based on to realize progress	nd milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are f the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be te them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,20 Web Form I appreciate alternative provide gra This altern me. The follow	e the opportu plans present eater pedestri- ative plan wo ing principle	ted in the dr an access. buld provide s should une	aft environmental e more opportunity derpin the park's fo	impact state for non-OR ormulation o	ment, I support V uses of the b f its final plan,	t the identi eaches an should it	anage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the ified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to d result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to not choose to enact Alternative D:	
	16 of the 6 least half o approach v chance to r * Put Natu consistent migrating, are minimu * Establish manageme degraded a implement as breeding Thank you	⁸ total miles f the beach sl vould provide ebound to its ral Resources with this prot and wintering ims and shou and Meet Cl nt targets in t bilities. Whee g ones. for the oppor	of Seashore nould be av- balanced a traditional First. Prote ection. The g species. W ld be increase ear Goals fe he DEIS, the re birds, tur very goals a trunity to pr	beach. This does ailable year round access for all visite numbers and dive ection of the natur: preferred plan fai vildlife protection used if necessary to or Wildlife Recovi- tey need more thou tles, and plants are re met. These goal	not represent for non-OR rss. Pedestria rsity within d al resources ls to set asid must be base o protect bre- ery. A plan r rough vetting e not coming ls, and adequ eents. I will b	t a fair balance V users and will ns and families he park. and wildlife of e adequate area ed on the best s eding birds and nust include cle g based on the p back as planne ate manageme	for other of ddlife. Cor a could the the Seash s that are cientific in sea turtle ear goals a sootential o dd, based on t to realize	nd milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are f the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be ze them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,20 Web Form I appreciate alternative provide gree This altern	e the opportu plans present eater pedestri	ted in the dr an access.	aft environmental	impact state	ment, I suppor	t the ident	anage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the ified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to d result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to	
	*Provide E 16 of the 6 least half o approach v	qual Access 8 total miles f the beach sl vould provide	for All Visi of Seashore hould be av balanced a	tors. Under the Na beach. This does ailable year round	ational Park not represen for non-OR ors. Pedestria	Service's prefer t a fair balance V users and will ns and families	red plan, A for other ldlife. Cor	not choose to enact Alternative D: Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at nbined with more walkways and better access facilities, this in more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a	

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

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

Correspondence ID:	6289 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y								
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:14:19								
Correspondence Type:	Way,07,2010 09:14:19 Web Form								
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.								
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important t me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Etablish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we								
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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 we								
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to								
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important t								
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Sacchore back. This does not arbitrate plance for other wear and wildlife. If ORV we is allowed within the park of								
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.								

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6292 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:19								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6293 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:19 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6294 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:20 Web Form I Internative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: **Description								
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.								

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6295 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private								
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the								
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified								
	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 Seashor 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 we. 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: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form								
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 wel as breeding ones.								
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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								

	0010621							
Received:	May,07,2010 09:14:26							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well 							
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6298 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:26							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,							
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well							
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6299 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:26							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to							
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this expressed to would be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this expressed to would be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. The part of the pressent at a start of the pressent at the part of the pressent at the part of the pressent at the part of the pressent of the part o							
	approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.							
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more							
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							

0010622
May,07,2010 09:14:26
Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resourc
6301 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
private May,07,2010 00:00:00
 Introjon, but on the second second
6302Project:10641Document:32596Private:Yprivate:May,07,2010 09:14:26Web FormI appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the pref

Name: private May,07,2010 00:00:00 **Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:**

Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6304 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:31 Web Form								
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only								
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.								
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6305 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:32 Web Form								
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.								
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be								

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6306 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:32 Web Form								
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I								
Correspondence ID:	6307 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:14:32 Web Form								
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.								
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.								
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6308 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:32 Web Form								
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore support wildlife ather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well								

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

0010625

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6309 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally 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: Name:	6310 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:14:32 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important t
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects t
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6311 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:32 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opp
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6312 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:32 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6313 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:37 Web Former							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6314 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:37 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to							
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and mildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the o							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6315 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:37 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to							

me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6316 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:37 Web Form							
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are							
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6317 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:37 Web Form							
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.							
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6318 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:37							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to							

me.

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

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

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

Name:	6319 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Received:	private 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 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 ORV's 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 consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.							
	Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name:	6320 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 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.							
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan							
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.							
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be 							
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we 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 							
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. 							
Correspondence ID:	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we 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. 6321 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 							
Name: Received:	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we 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. 6321 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:43 							
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we 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. 6321 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:43 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we 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. 							

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6322 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May 07 2010 00:14:43							
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:14:43 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ractovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife and on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be follo							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6323 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 09:14:43 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife pro							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6324 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:43 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only							

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:14:43 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the				
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to				
	 me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. 				
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.				
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6326 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:43 e: Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. C alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modi provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are impor me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round or 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could he chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breed migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protect to must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferre are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife r				
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6327 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:43 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.				

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6328 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Kante Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May.07,2010 09:14:49 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife raher than on its recent degraded a
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6329 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:49 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet
Correspondence ID:	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

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

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

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

Name:	6331 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Kanci- Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:14:50 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be imple							
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this							
	approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as w as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6334 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 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 provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important 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 onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred pla are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.							
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:14:51 Web Form							
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a							
	least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.							
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as w							
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6336 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:56							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of th alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified							
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me.							

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6337 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:14:56							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the na							
	6338 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May.07.2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 Terms circling above an sandy area in the wetland. Upon approaching closer, I noticed a group of young men who were motorcycle stunt riding in the area. We bacched the boat and went ashore. I stoppe the bikers and pointed out that they were riding among the nesting Terms. 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 th nesting area, and sent them on their way. One afternoon of play essentially destroyed the efforts of the colony that year. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the baches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on							

Correspondence ID:	6339	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						

	0010635
Received:	May,07,2010 09:14:56
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resource
Correspondence ID:	6340 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:14:56 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	 me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rate minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6341 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:01
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with the preferred plan fails to act acide adequate areas that are fee of ORV use user round for wildlife including breading.
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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

	0010636						
Received:	May,07,2010 09:15:02						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources						
Correspondence ID:	6343 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y						
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:15:02						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to						
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more						
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6344 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:02						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be						
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent						
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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						

Correspondence ID:	6345	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						

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: Name: Received:	6346 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:08							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to							
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:							
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name:	6347 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private							
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:15:08 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to							
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:							
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent 							
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name:	6348 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private							

0010637

Received:

	0010638					
Received:	May,07,2010 09:15:08					
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather t					
Correspondence ID:	6349 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y					
Name:	private					
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:15:08 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to					
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.					
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:15:08					
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.					
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.					
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be					
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be					
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.					
Correspondence ID: Name:	6351 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private					

Correspondence ID:6351Project:10641Document:32596Private:Name:private	Y
---	---

	0010639					
Received:	May,07,2010 09:15:08					
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me					
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rare minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects					
Correspondence ID:	6352 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y					
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:15:10					
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to					
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more					
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6353 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:14 Web Form					
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.					
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be					
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent					
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.					
Companyondon as ID:	· ·					
Correspondence ID:	6354 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y					

Correspondence ID:	6354	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						

	0010640
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:15:14 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the postention. Siddlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the postent to realize them, should be for migrating and wint
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6355 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plans ould 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 of the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more tho
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6356 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:14 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife nichulding breeding, ministing and miles or

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred place are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6357 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:14 Web Form						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.						
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,						
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.						
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6358 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 endarged 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 the optical to the other to the track of the other to the other to the other to the other to be other t						
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.						
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well						
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6359 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:20 Web Form						
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.						
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan						
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be						

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6360 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:20						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 ¹May,07,2010 09:15:20 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and						
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6361 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:20 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough yetting based on the best scientific information. Wildlife rather than on its recen						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6362 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:20 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet						

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID:	6363 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:15:20 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:15:20 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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: Name:	6365 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:15:20 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6366 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y						
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:15:20 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to						
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resource						
Correspondence ID:	6367 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y						
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian 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 us of these areas by vehicles. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural aresources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife tarber than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6368 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 09:15:27 Web Form I I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased						

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

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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: Name:	6369 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y						
Received:	May,07,2010 09:15:27						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to						
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the						
Correspondence ID:	6370 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y						
Name:	private May 07 2010 00:15:27						
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:15:27 Web Form						
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the						
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.						
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to						
	me.						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only						
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore bach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.						
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.						
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well						
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
Correspondence ID: Name:	6371 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private						
Received:	May,07,2010 09:15:27						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of 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						

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6372 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:15:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
F	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Componendones ID:	6373 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Correspondence ID: Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6374 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
. .	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:	6375 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y		
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:15:27		
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide groups production access.		
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.		
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohi 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is alle least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and bet approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreation consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wild migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance but are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife reavery. management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife raid degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protect implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Note Fright. For Potential Document. Second Final: 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.		
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6377 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:32 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for on-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. 		

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

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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: Name: Received:	6378 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:33						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:15:53 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more						
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6379 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 09:15:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Rec						
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6380 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are						

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6381 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private						
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:15:33 Web Form						
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.						
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the n						
Correspondence ID:	6382 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y						
Name: Received:	private 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:15:34						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the						
correspondence.	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to						
	me.						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at here the following the seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at						
	least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a						
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be						
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan						
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are						
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management 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						

					0010	0650	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Forn I apprecia alternativ provide g This alter me. The follow *Provide 16 of the least half chance to * Put Nat consisten migrating are minim * Establis managem degraded	the the opportu e plans presen reater pedestri native plan wo wing principle Equal Access 68 total miles of the beach si would provide rebound to its ural Resources t with this prot g, and winterin nums and shou wh and Meet Cl ent targets in t abilities. Whe net duntil recov	ted in the di an access. ould provide s should un for All Visi of Seashore hould be av balanced a traditional s First. Prote action. The g species. V ld be increa lear Goals f the DEIS, tur	raft environmental e more opportunity derpin the park's f itors. Under the Na beach. This does railable year round access for all visito numbers and dive ection of the natur e preferred plan fai Wildlife protection ased if necessary to for Wildlife Recov- ney need more tho rtles, and plants are	32596 nal Park Ser impact state y for non-OR ormulation c ational Park i not represen for non-OR for non-OR rors. Pedestria rsity within i al resources ls to set asid must be basis o protect bre- ery. A plan r rough vetting e not coming	Private: vice's proposed ment, I suppor V uses of the b f its final plan, Service's prefer t a fair balance V users and wi ns and families he park. and wildlife of e adequate area ed on the best s eding birds and nust include cle g based on the p back as planne	Y I plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the t the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to be aches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to a should it not choose to enact Alternative D: rred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only of or other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at ldlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this s could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be as that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan as an unilestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent ed, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be in to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well the organize them.
	Thank yo	u for the oppo	• •	rovide these comn hat better protects		-	e progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Forn I apprecia alternativ provide g This alter me. The follor *Provide 16 of the least half approach chance to * Put Nat consisten migrating are minin * Establis managem degraded implemer as breedin Thank yo	the the opportu e plans presen reater pedestri native plan wo wing principle Equal Access 68 total miles of the beach s would provide rebound to its ural Resources t with this prot g, and winterin nums and shou sh and Meet Cl ent targets in t abilities. Whe neted until recov- ng ones. u for the oppo	ted in the di an access. Juld provide s should un for All Visi of Seashore hould be av balanced a traditional s First. Prote ection. The g species. V ld be increa lear Goals f he DEIS, th re birds, tur very goals a rtunity to pu	raft environmental e more opportunity derpin the park's f itors. Under the Na e beach. This does vailable year round access for all visite numbers and dive ection of the nature preferred plan fai Vildlife protection ased if necessary to for Wildlife Recov- ney need more tho rtles, and plants are are met. These goa	impact state ormulation of ational Park i not represen for non-OR rs. Pedestria rsity within t ls to set asid must be bass o protect bre- ery. A plan r rough vetting e not coming ls, and adequ-	ement, I suppor V uses of the b of its final plan, Service's prefer t a fair balance V users and wi ns and families he park. and wildlife of e adequate area ed on the best s eding birds and nust include cla g based on the p back as planne iate manageme be following the	ear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent ed, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be ent to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well e progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Forn I apprecia alternativ provide g This alter me. The follor *Provide 16 of the least half approach chance to * Put Nat consisten migrating are minin * Establis managem degraded implemer as breedin Thank yo	the the opportu e plans presen reater pedestri native plan wo wing principle Equal Access 68 total miles of the beach s' would provide rebound to its ural Resources t with this prot g, and winterin nums and shou sh and Meet Cl enent targets in t abilities. Whe net duntil recov- ng ones. u for the oppo	ted in the di an access. Juld provide s should un for All Visi of Seashore hould be av balanced a traditional s First. Prote ection. The g species. V Id be increa lear Goals f he DEIS, th re birds, tur very goals a rtunity to pu	raft environmental e more opportunity derpin the park's f itors. Under the Na e beach. This does vailable year round access for all visite numbers and dive ection of the nature preferred plan fai Vildlife protection ased if necessary to for Wildlife Recov- ney need more tho rtles, and plants are are met. These goa	impact state ormulation of ational Park i not represen for non-OR rs. Pedestria rsity within t ls to set asid must be bass o protect bre- ery. A plan r rough vetting e not coming ls, and adequ nents. I will t	ment, I suppor V uses of the b of its final plan, Service's prefer t a fair balance V users and wi ns and families the park. and wildlife of e adequate area ed on the best s eding birds and nust include cle g based on the p back as planne tate manageme be following the	ear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent ed, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be ent to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well e progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

	0010651							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6387 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:40 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to							
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to							
me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year rou 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within th least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access fac approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife co chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the pr are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on i degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering sp as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.								
Correspondence ID: Name:	6388 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:15:40 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:							
	 ^{AP}Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORV's would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6389 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00							
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May 07, 2010 00:000 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative 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 them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based o							

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: Name: Received:							
	6390 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:45						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to						
	 me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more 						
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6391 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:45 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to						
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are						
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
Correspondence ID: Name:	6392 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private						
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form						
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to						

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6393 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:46
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6394 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:46
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6395 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:48
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6396 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:52 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I
Common and an as ID:	6207 Designets 10641 Decomposite 22506 Designets V
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6397 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:52 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
correspondence.	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6398 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:52 Web Form I I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative name would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6399 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:52
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 rate rhan on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be increase as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6400 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide 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 mildlife 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 wild
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6401 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:52 Web Form 1 appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife fisturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must includue clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID:	6402 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:15:52 Web Form							
correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better ac approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wi chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational us consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife it migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers i are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather t degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective n implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wint as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look								
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6403 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:52 Web Form							
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to							
me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and beter ac approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wi chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife in migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers i are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather the degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective n implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wint as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6404 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:15:58 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to							
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent							

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

Name: Received:	private							
	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 me.							
	 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred pla are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent 							
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be							
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as w as breeding ones.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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							
lame:	private							
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:15:58 Web Form							
orrespondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the							
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified							
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, and least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as w as breeding ones.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence D:	6407 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Correspondence ID: Name:	6407 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private							
Received:	May,07,2010 09:15:58							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the							
Correspondence.	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to							
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to							
	me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a description of the beach should be available year of the provide the provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a description of the provide balanced access for all visitors.							
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are							

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID:	6408 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:15:58							
Correspondence Type:	Web Form Langregiste the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the							
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to							
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:							
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.							
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well							
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name:	6409 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private							
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:16:04 Web Form							
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.							
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6410 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:04							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a							
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan							
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be							

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Name:	6411 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Received:	private May,07,2010 09:16:04							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name:	6412 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private							
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:16:04 Web Form							
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6413 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:04 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the							
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be							

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID:	6414 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y						
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:16:04 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the						
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.						
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more						
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6415 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:04 Web Form						
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.						
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resourc						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6416 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:04 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to						
	 provide grater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be 						

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. 								
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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								
lame:	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								
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.								
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								
	me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:								
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only								
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this								
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a								
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.								
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a								
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan								
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.								
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rate minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are								
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rare minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent								
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rate minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are								
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.								
	 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rain minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we 								
-	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.6419Project:10641Document:32596Private:Y								
ame:	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as been of real of all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 6419 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y								
ame: eceived:	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be 								
ame: Received: Correspondence Type:	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rae minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. 6419 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 6419 Project: 10641								
ame: Received: Correspondence Type:	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rare minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rater than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on nanual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. 6419 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I I Jocument: 32596 Private: Y Ma								
lame: Received: Correspondence Type:	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rae minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. 6419 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 6419 Project: 10641								
lame: Received: Correspondence Type:	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rais to reduce the equilibrium of the Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. 6419 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmen								
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could the more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First, Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan raminums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. 6419 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedest								
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery where there are management targets in the Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan the unit leaded adulties. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. 6419 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 7010 00:00:00 Web Form 1 appreciate the opportunity to comment on the								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could the more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First, Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan raminums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. 6419 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedest								
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 6419 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Privat: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 1 appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's propo								
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrinas and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife ractovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plan or all vistors that better protects the natural resource's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. Thak you for the opportun								
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife for the cessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 6419 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private: May, 07, 2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environme								
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Charly Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y Private: May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of 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 mote. The following principles should underp								
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife for the cessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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 the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrina access. This alternative plan wo								

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6420 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:10 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
correspondence.	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6421 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:16:10 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6422 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:16:10 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6423 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:10								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t 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 AREASTHOSE THAT ARE STILL LEFT. Thank you.								
Correspondence ID: Name:	6424 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y								
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:16:10 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:								
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred pla are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as w as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the								
Correspondence ID:	6425 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y								
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:16:16 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and w								
Correspondence ID: Name:	6426 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private								
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:16:16 Web Form								

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

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

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

Correspondence ID:	6427 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:16:16 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the							
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rare minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more							
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6428 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:16 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plans would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming ba							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6429 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:17 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to							
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only							

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:16:16
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6431 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:17
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified 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 reviews, additional protective inclusion of the protective inclusion
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6432 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:17
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 09:16:22 Web Form							
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife racher than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources							
Correspondence ID:	6434 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:16:22							
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as bree							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6435 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:22							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6436 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:16:22 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all wisitors the natural recoverse of th
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6437 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:22
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this
	approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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 well managed for future generations.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6438 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:22 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6439 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:22 Web Form						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at paroach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These g						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6440 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:28 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goa						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6441 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the elternative plane appreciate in the draft antiscommental impact statement. L support the identified "antiscommentally preferred" Alternative D if medified to						

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

provide greater pedestrian access.

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 reprecussions, 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.

Correspondence ID: Name:	6442 Pr private	roject:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y	
Received:	May,07,2010	09:16:28						
Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6443 Pr private May,07,2010 Web Form I appreciate t alternative pl provide great This alternati me. The followin *Provide Equ 16 of the 68 t least half of t approach woo chance to reb * Put Natural consistent wi	roject: 0 09:16:28 he opportun ans presente er pedestria ve plan wou g principles tal Access fi otal miles o he beach sh uld provide oound to its i Resources th this prote	10641 ity to comm d in the dr n access. ild provide should und or All Visit f Seashore ould be avait balanced a balanced a First. Protection. The	aft environmental more opportunity derpin the park's f tors. Under the Na beach. This does ailable year round ccess for all visito numbers and dive ection of the natur preferred plan fai	32596 nal Park Serr i impact state y for non-OR ormulation o ational Park S not represen for non-OR ors. Pedestria ors. Pedestria srsity within t al resources s ls to set aside	Private: vice's proposed ment, I support V uses of the b f its final plan, Service's prefer t a fair balance V users and will ns and families he park. and wildlife of e adequate area	Y plan to n the iden eaches ar should it red plan, for other dlife. Co could th the Seash s that are	manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the titified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to nd result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important t t not choose to enact Alternative D: . Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only r users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at mbined with more walkways and better access facilities, this ten more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a hore should come first, and recreational use should be there of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan
	are minimum * Establish an management degraded abil implemented as breeding o Thank you for	as and should and Meet Cle targets in the lities. Where until recover ones. or the opport	d be increa ar Goals fo e DEIS, th e birds, turt ery goals an unity to pr	sed if necessary to or Wildlife Recov- ey need more thou tles, and plants are re met. These goa	o protect bree ery. A plan n rough vetting e not coming ls, and adequ nents. I will b	eding birds and nust include cle based on the p back as planne ate management e following the	sea turtle ear goals a potential o d, based nt to reali e progress	es. and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be ize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we s of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 Web Form		10641 ity to com	Document:	32596 nal Park Serv	Private: vice's proposed	Y plan to n	nanage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

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

This alternative 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:16:28							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May, 07, 2010 09, 16, 28 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals an							
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6446 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:28 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least helf of the beach should be available wear round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access forcilities their the statement of the descent should be available wear round for non-ORV users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at							
	 least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rare minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be 							
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6447 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:34 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the							

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

provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6448 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:16:34 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degrad
Commentation De	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6449 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:34 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative 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 them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, tury end more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, tury, end more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife reture than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as plannet, based on annual reviews, additional pr
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6450 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:34 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants a
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6452 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07.2010 09:16:34 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan. Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on the postential of the Seashore to supopt wild
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.

Correspondence ID:	6454 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name:	private							
Received:	May,07,2010 09:16:39							
Correspondence Type:	Web Form							
Correspondence:	 We form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife lower a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rater than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6455 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:39 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be provibed year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to robound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they							
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.

Correspondence ID:	6457 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name:	private							
Received:	May,07,2010 09:16:39							
Correspondence Type:	Web Form							
Correspondence:	 We round I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate area shat are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rater tha							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6458 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 09:16:40 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife of the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore bend for wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding brids and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the be							
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.

Correspondence ID:	6460 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name:	private							
Received:	May,07,2010 09:16:40							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 09:16:40 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilites, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and ade							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 6461 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plans would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. IF 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 the me. The disparity between recreation and wildlife use is intollerable. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families coult the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent							
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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6463 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:45 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to							
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to							
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,							
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more							
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6464 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:45 Web Form							
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to							
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well 							
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6465 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:45							

	0010611
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6466 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:45 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plans vould provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative FORV use is allowed within the park, at leas thalf of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Part Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore bound for wildlife in clouding breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Alternatives and fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6467 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:45 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan vould provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for on-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife racter than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not croming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measure
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6468 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:50

Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6469 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:50 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the o
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6470 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:50 Web Form I I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. "The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be probibilet gear round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of ORV use year round for nwildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the beashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6471 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:50

	0010879
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and millife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced scress for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for mig
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6472 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:000 Web Form 1 appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 w
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6473 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:55 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plans would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and mildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scintific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rater than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional prote
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6474 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6475 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 09:16:56 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be compared in necessary to proteet breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequat						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6476 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:56 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and mildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones fo						

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6477 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:16:56							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.							
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name:	6478 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:17:01 Web Form							
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only							
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.							
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name:	6479 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:17:01 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to							
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only							
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan							
	 are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent 							
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.							

				0010	682				
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	alternative plans pre provide greater pede To whom it may coo I can't believe that a AND IN A TEN YE vehicle drivers/user: the story and be the This alternative plan me. The following princ *Provide Equal Acc 16 of the 68 total mi least half of the bead approach would pro chance to rebound to * Put Natural Resou consistent with this migrating, and winto are minimums and s * Establish and Mee management targets degraded abilities. V implemented until r as breeding ones. Thank you for the o balanced final plan 6481 Project: private May,07,2010 09:17: Web Form I appreciate the opp alternative plans pre provide greater pede This alternative plan The following princ *Provide Equal Acc 16 of the 68 total mi	ortunity to commented in the dr strian access. corem: 1 87% decline i AR SPAN THI is enough to li final arbiter of j would provide ples should un- ess for All Visi les of Seashore h should be av- vide balanced a its traditional crees First. Prote- protection. The ring species. We nould be increas t Clear Goals ft in the DEIS, the /here birds, tur- /covery goals and portunity to pro- or all visitors the 10641 01 ortunity to commented in the dr strian access. would provide ples should un- ess for All Visi- les of Seashore	aft environmental In the colonial bird IS HAS HAPPEN mit those who wo your decisions more opportunity derpin the park's fit tors. Under the Na beach. This does ailable year round ccess for all visito numbers and dive ection of the nature preferred plan fai /ildlife protection sed if necessary to or Wildlife Recove er met. These goal ovide these comm hat better protects Document: ment on the Natio aft environmental more opportunity derpin the park's fit tors. Under the Natio aft cons. Under the Natio aft construction the Natio aft environmental more opportunity derpin the park's fit tors. Under the Nation beach. This does	32596 nal Park Serv impact states d population a EDand ther uld love to vi y for non-OR' for non-OR' for non-OR' for non-OR' prs. Pedestriat al resources a ls to set aside must be base o protect bree ery. A plan m rough vetting e not coming ls, and adequ hents. I will b the natural re- 32596 nal Park Serv impact states y for non-OR' for non-OR' for non-OR' for non-OR' and adequ hents. I will b the natural re- 32596 nal Park Serv impact states y for non-OR' for non-OR'	Private: rice's proposed ment, I support at the Cape isn' a there are the t sit and enjoy th V uses of the b f its final plan, service's prefer a fair balance / users and will as and families he park. and wildlife of f a dequate areas d on the best s ding birds and must include cle based on the p back as planne ate management e following the essources of the Private: rice's proposed ment, I support V uses of the b f its final plan, ervice's prefer a fair balance	the identified t enough to n urtles AND (he NATURA eaches and re should it not red plan, Alte for other used dlife. Combin could then n the Seashore s that are free cientific infor sea turtles. ar goals and otential of th d, based on a tt to realize th progress of Seashore. Y plan to mana the identified eaches and re should it not red plan, Alte for other used	d "environmentally pref handate strict regulation DTHER WILDLIFE. A L WONDERS of Cape esult in less disturbance choose to enact Alterna emative F, ORVs would rs and wildlife. If ORV ned with more walkway nore safely enjoy the Se should come first, and n e of ORV use year round mation. Wildlife distur milestones for wildlife i e Seashore to support w nnual reviews, addition nem, should be for mign your efforts at Cape Ha d "environmentally pref esult in less disturbance choose to enact Alterna emative F, ORVs would rs and wildlife. If ORV	I be prohibited year round on o use is allowed within the park, is and better access facilities, the ashore, and wildlife could have recreational use should be d for wildlife including breeding bance buffers in the preferred precovery. Where there are recovery. Where there are relidlife rather than on its recent al protective measures should ating and wintering species as theras and look forward to a measure fatteras National Seashore. Of ferred " Alternative D if modifie of wildlife, which are important	ied to irds d ld tell ant to only k, at this ve a ing, plan nt be s well nore f the fied to ant to only k, at
	me. The following prince *Provide Equal Acc 16 of the 68 total mi least half of the bead approach would pro chance to rebound te * Put Natural Resour consistent with this migrating, and winte are minimums and s * Establish and Mee management targets degraded abilities. V implemented until m as breeding ones.	ples should un ess for All Visi les of Seashore h should be ava- vide balanced a o its traditional rces First. Prote protection. The rring species. W nould be increa t Clear Goals ft in the DEIS, th /here birds, tur ccovery goals a poprtunity to pr	derpin the park's for tors. Under the Na beach. This does ailable year round ccess for all visito numbers and dive extion of the natur- preferred plan fai /ildlife protection sed if necessary to or Wildlife Recove ey need more thou tles, and plants are re met. These goal	ormulation of ational Park S not represent for non-ORV rss. Pedestriau rsity within th al resources a ls to set aside must be base to protect bree ery. A plan m rough vetting ls, and adequ nents. I will b	f its final plan, ervice's prefer a fair balance / users and will as and families he park. and wildlife of a dequate areas d on the best so ding birds and nust include cle based on the back as planne ate management	should it not red plan, Alte for other use dlife. Combin could then n the Seashore s that are free cientific infor sea turtles. ar goals and d, based on a at to realize th	choose to enact Alterna rmative F, ORVs would rs and wildlife. If ORV ned with more walkway nore safely enjoy the Se should come first, and ne of ORV use year round rmation. Wildlife distur milestones for wildlife t e Seashore to support w nnual reviews, addition nem, should be for mign	tive D: be prohibited year round on ouse is allowed within the park.	only k, at this ve a ing, plan nt l be s well
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	alternative plans pre provide greater pede	ortunity to com sented in the dr strian access.	aft environmental	impact state	ment, I support	the identified	d "environmentally pref	atteras National Seashore. Of ferred" Alternative D if modifie of wildlife, which are imported	ied to

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

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

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

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

* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:17:01 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
Correspondence:	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6484 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:01 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resourc
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6485 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:03 Web Form I I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the beashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrat

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6486 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:06 Web Form								
Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								
	me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.								
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.								
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.								
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6487 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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. I 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: Name: Received:	6488 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:07								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.								
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are 								
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel								
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more								

	0010685
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize t
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6490 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:07 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative, OKV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Etablish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ractver than on its rec
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6491 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07.2010 09:17:07 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6492 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:07

Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's prefered plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6493 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:12 Web Form I approciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. * Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the beast scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtls. * Put Natural Resources First. Pro
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6494 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 09:17:13 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. * Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F. ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and mildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to reboomt to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Stablish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6495 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type:	Web Form	
Correspondence:	I appreciate	

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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: Name: Received:	6496 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:13 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6497 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:13 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access failities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet C

 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.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6499 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:13 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6500 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:13 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	 me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

 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.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6502 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:18 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID: Name:	6503 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:18
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ractivery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

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.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6505 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:18 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
Correspondence ID:	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 6506 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:17:18 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative 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 y
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6508 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:18 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6509 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:18 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park. *Provide Equal Access First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to robound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore bound to its readitional protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife rotevery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough verting based on the best scientific information. Wildlife rotevery. Where there are management targets in the preferred plan mus include clear goals and milestones for wildli

Name:

private

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6510 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:19
Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID: Name:	6511 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:17:24 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only
	 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6512 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 09:17:24 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, si approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilit

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6513 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:24
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6514 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:24 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chace to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for suidlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as br
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6515 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:24 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for on-ORV users and awildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife includuing breeding, migrati
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: Name:	6516 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:17:24 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	 me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6517 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:24 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be imple
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6518 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07.2010 09:17:24 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, m
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: Name: Paggiyad:	6519 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:17:25 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects t
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6520 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:30 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
Correspondence:	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this
	approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rare minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ractorery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be increased so as we as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6521 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:30 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plar are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6522 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:30 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6523 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:30 Web Form Y
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rear principume and chernel the interpret the preferred plan for a preferred plan. Wildlife and the protection for the preferred plan for the preferred plan for the preferred plan for the preferred plan.
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6524 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:30 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	 provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

~	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6525 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:30
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID:	6526 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:17:30 Web Form 1 appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection on the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:31 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as a

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6528 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:35
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID:	6529 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:17:35 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abiliti
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6530 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:36 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	 alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6531 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:36
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife racher than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Comos on don oo IDo	6522 Duringte 10641 Degements 22506 Durington V
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6532 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:36 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resource
Correspondence ID:	6533 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:17:36 Web Form 1 appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recen

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6534 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:36
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Correspondence ID:	6535 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:17:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should undergin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not shouse to enset Alternative D:
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ractovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6537 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:41
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID:	6538 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:17:41 Web Form 1 appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the best scientific information. Wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional prote
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6539 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals ar

Common co los m	6540 Brainste 10641 Documente 22506 Brites V
Correspondence ID: Name:	6540 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles,
	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: Received:	private 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID: Name:	6542 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:17:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

Name:	6543 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:17:41 Web Form
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 I understand it, this alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Correspondence ID:	6544 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:17:46
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
Correspondence	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6545 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:46 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6546 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:17:46 Web Form
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6547 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6548 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:46 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6549 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:17:46 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Correspondence ID:	6550 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:17:46
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
Correspondence:	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6551 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:47
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6552 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:17:52 Web Form
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Correspondence ID:	6553 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:17:52
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6554 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:52 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

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

Correspondence ID:	6555 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 09:17:53 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more belanced final plan for all wisitors that heatter protect the
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6556 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May.07,2010 09:17:53 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be sufficiencluding breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea utrites. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear g
	· · ·
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6557 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:53 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6558 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:17:53 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Correspondence ID:	6559 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:17:53
Correspondence Type:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
Correspondence:	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6560 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private 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.

Correspondence ID: Name:	6561 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May.07,2010 09:17:58 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resourc
Correspondence ID:	6562 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:17:58
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
correspondence.	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6563 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:17:58
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6564 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:17:58 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Correspondence ID:	6565 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private 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 rather than on its recent management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:17:58 Web Form
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

Correspondence ID:	6567 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:17:58 Web Form
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Correspondence ID:	6568 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:18:04
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
correspondence.	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6569 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:04
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide 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
	 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance 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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6573 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:04
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID:	6574 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:18:09
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6575 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:09 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6576 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:18:09 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Correspondence ID:	6577 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:18:09
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative 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: Name: Received:	6578 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:09
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This 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 following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and dividlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

Correspondence ID:	6579 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:18:09
Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	 consistent with this protection. The preference plan rais to set as the adequate area are ince of OKV use year found for within including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:18:09
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6581 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:18:09 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

Correspondence ID:	6582 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 09:18:09 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:18:15
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6584 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:15 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to remark the restatement protection.
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

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

Correspondence ID:	6585 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:18:15
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6586 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private 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: Name:	6587 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 09:18:15
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this
	approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

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

Correspondence ID:	6588 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:18:20
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resourc
	balanced final plan for an visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seasnore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6589 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 beutiful place and ORV add nothing to it. Careless ORVers destroy habitat and wildlife, There are precious few wild places left and this is one that needs maximum protection. Pleasure ORVers 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. ORVers have other places to go, wildlife is captive and rapidly diminishing. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balance daccess for all visitors. Pdestrians and families 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
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6590 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 09:18:20 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

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

Correspondence ID:	6591 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:18:20
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	 The billowing pintopies should be parks structure in the parks structure in the tructure of the tructure between the present of the
Correspondence ID:	6592 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:18:20
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide grater predestion accords.
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6593 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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:

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

Correspondence ID:	6594 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private 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 wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6595 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 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 facew with vocal publics that have significant concerns with their activities. Thy are less colaborative 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: Name: Received:	6596 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:21
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be includented until a protective measures are particle with the formulation of the formulation of the seashore to be and the formulation of the seashore to be additional protective measures should be includented until a protective measure of the seashore of the seashore to be added to be formulated on the potential of the formulation of the seashore to be added to b
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

	0010721								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6597 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the								
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important t								
	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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6598 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:26 Web Form								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6599 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:26 Web Form								
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.								
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent 								
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6600 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:26								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.								

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

me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6601 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y								
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:18:26 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This 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 following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife racher than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resource								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6602 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:26 Web Form 1 appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its raditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6603 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:26 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6604 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6605 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Stablish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there ar management targets in the DEIS, they need more updroved
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6606 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

me.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6607 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private						
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:18:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Wher						
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6608 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife pr						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6609 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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: Name: Received:	6610 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:33									
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access.									
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.									
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resource									
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6611 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to									
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.									
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6612 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" 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.

Name: Received:	6613 Proj private May,07,2010 09		Document:	32596	Private:	Y	
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the alternative plan: provide greater This alternative me. The following p *Provide Equal 16 of the 68 tota least half of the approach would chance to rebou * Put Natural R consistent with migrating, and are minimums a * Establish and management tau degraded abiliti implemented ur as breeding one	opportunity to co s presented in the pedestrian access plan would provi principles should to Access for All Vi al miles of Seash beach should be i provide balanced nd to its tradition: esources First. Pri this protection. TI wintering species. and should be incri Meet Clear Goal gets in the DEIS, es. Where birds, t atil recovery goals s.	draft environmental de more opportunity inderpin the park's f sitors. Under the Na re beach. This does wailable year round access for all visite al numbers and dive otection of the natur is preferred plan fai Wildlife protection eased if necessary to for Wildlife Recov- they need more tho urtles, and plants are are met. These goa	impact state y for non-OR ormulation o ational Park S not represent for non-OR yrs. Pedestriau rsity within t al resources a ls to set aside must be base o protect bree ery. A plan n rough vetting e not coming ls, and adequ	ment, I support V uses of the b f its final plan, service's prefer a fair balance / users and will s and families he park. and wildlife of a adequate area d on the best s ding birds and nust include cla based on the p back as planne ate management	the identified "em- eaches and result i should it not choor red plan, Alternati- for other users and dlife. Combined w could then more s the Seashore shoul s that are free of O cientific information sea turtles. ar goals and miles potential of the Sea d, based on annual at to realize them, s	RV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the vironmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified n less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to see to enact Alternative D: we F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at ith more walkways and better access facilities, this afely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a d come first, and recreational use should be RV use year round for wildlife including breeding, n. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred pla tones for wildlife recovery. Where there are shore to support wildlife rather than on its recent reviews, additional protective measures should be should be for migrating and wintering species as we efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:		ect: 10641	Document:				
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	alternative plans provide greater This alternative me.	s presented in the pedestrian access plan would provi	draft environmental de more opportunity	impact state	ment, I support	the identified "env	RV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the vironmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified n less disturbance of wildlife, which are important t
	*Provide Equal 16 of the 68 tota least half of the approach would chance to rebou * Put Natural R consistent with migrating, and are minimums a * Establish and management tau degraded abiliti implemented ur as breeding one Thank you for t	Access for All Vi al miles of Seash beach should be a l provide balancec nd to its tradition esources First. Pri this protection. TI wintering species. and should be incr Meet Clear Goals rgets in the DEIS, es. Where birds, t til recovery goals s. he opportunity to	re beach. This does wailable year round access for all visite al numbers and dive otection of the natur be preferred plan fai Wildlife protection eased if necessary to for Wildlife Recov- they need more thou artles, and plants are are met. These goa	ational Park S not represent for non-OR ¹ pors. Pedestria rrsity within t al resources a ls to set aside must be base o protect bree ery. A plan n rough vetting e not coming ls, and adequ	ervice's prefer a fair balance / users and wil ss and families he park. ind wildlife of a dequate area d on the best s ding birds and just include cle based on the p back as planne ate management	red plan, Alternati- for other users and dlife. Combined w could then more s the Seashore shoul s that are free of O cientific informatic sea turtles. ar goals and miles obtained of the Sea d, based on annual at to realize them, s	se to enact Alternative D: we F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at ith more walkways and better access facilities, this afely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a d come first(!), and recreational use should be RV use year round for wildlife including breeding, on. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred pla tones for wildlife recovery. Where there are shore to support wildlife rather than on its recent reviews, additional protective measures should be should be for migrating and wintering species as we efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

me.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6616 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:38 Web Form I I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6617 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 09:18:38 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for on-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including bre							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6618 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May.07.2010 00:00:00 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F. ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including bredeing, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife prot							

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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

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: Name: Received:	6619 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:38									
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to									
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects t									
Correspondence ID:	6620 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y									
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:18:44 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife receivery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rater than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrat									
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6621 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:44 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should core first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including									

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6622 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:44								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.								
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me								
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more								
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.								
Correspondence ID: Name:	6623 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private								
Received:	May,07,2010 09:18:44								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.								
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects								
Correspondence ID:	6624 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y								
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:18:44 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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								

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

Correspondence ID:	6625 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y						
Name:	private						
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative 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 of the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more through vetting based on the postential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent d						
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6626 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:44 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and millies could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come invikutifie including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife fectovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Whe						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6627 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:49 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.						

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6628 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private							
Received:	May,07,2010 09:18:49 Web Form							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the							
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access.							
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to							
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:							
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be							
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private 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							
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to							
	me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.							
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. Please protect the wildlife more. at Cape Hatteras. Thank you.							
Correspondence ID:	6631 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:18:50							

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: Name: Received:	•	Project:)10 09:18:50	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y			
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to									
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects t									
Correspondence ID:	6633	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y			
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:18:50 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:									
	*Provide 1 16 of the e least half e approach ' chance to chance to approach ' e ut Natu consistent migrating, are minim * Establish manageme degraded a implemen as breedin Thank you	Equal Access f 58 total miles of f the beach sh would provide rebound to its irral Resources with this prote and wintering ums and shoul n and Meet Cle ent targets in th abilities. When ted until recover g ones.	or All Visito of Seashore b ould be avait balanced acc traditional n First. Protect cction. The p species. Wi d be increase ar Goals for ae DEIS, the e birds, turth ery goals are tunity to pro	ors. Under the Na beach. This does n lable year round cess for all visitor umbers and diver tion of the natura preferred plan fail ldlife protection n ed if necessary to Wildlife Recove y need more thor es, and plants are e met. These goals	tional Park S not represent for non-OR ^V rs. Pedestriat sity within ti l resources a s to set aside must be base protect bree ry. A plan n ough vetting not coming s, and adequ ents. I will b	Service's prefer a fair balance V users and wi ns and families he park. und wildlife of a adequate area ed on the best s iding birds and sust include cle based on the p back as planne ate manageme e following the	red plan, for other Idlife. Cos s could th the Seash is that are is that are is that are is that are is contific sea turtle are goals potential is do not be to reali	Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at mbined with more walkways and better access facilities, this en more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a nore should come first, and recreational use should be free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan es. and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be ize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well s of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more		
Correspondence ID:	6634	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y			
Correspondence Type: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:18:55 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only									
	least half of approach of chance to * Put Natu consistent migrating, are minim	of the beach sh would provide rebound to its rral Resources with this prote and wintering ums and shoul	ould be avai balanced ac- traditional n First. Protec ection. The p species. Wi d be increase	lable year round cess for all visitor umbers and diver tion of the natura preferred plan fail ldlife protection ed if necessary to	for non-ORV rs. Pedestrian sity within the d resources a s to set aside must be base protect bree	V users and wi ns and families he park. and wildlife of a dequate area ad on the best s ading birds and	Idlife. Co s could th the Seash is that are is cientific sea turth	users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at mbined with more walkways and better access facilities, this en more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a nore should come first, and recreational use should be free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan es. and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are		

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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: Name: Received:	6635 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:55								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.								
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.								
	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: Received:	private 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.								
Correspondence ID:	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.								
Correspondence ID: Name:	6637 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private								
Received:	May,07,2010 09:18:55								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the								
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to								
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								
	me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a								
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.								
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan								
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are								

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:	6638 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y								
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 09:18:55 Wab Form								
Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.								
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the n								
Correspondence ID:	6639 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y								
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:18:55 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targe								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6640 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:18:55 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and mildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan								

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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: Name:	6641 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private								
Received:	May,07,2010 09:19:01 Web Form								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t								
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important t me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ractovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will								
Correspondence ID: Name:	6642 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 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								
	provide greater pedestrian access.								
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:								
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only								
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chone to the transformed within the transformation of the provide balanced access for all visitors.								
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan								
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until requirements on the targets of the degraded additional protective measures on the measures of the season of the seas								
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.								
Correspondence ID: Name: Popoivod:	6643 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May 07 2010 00:10:02								
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:19:02 Web Form								
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access.								
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.								
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan 								
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are								

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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: Name:	6644 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private								
Received:	May,07,2010 09:19:02								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the								
correspondences	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to								
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only								
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.								
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan								
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well we have the protective measures of the season of the s								
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.								
Correspondence ID: Name:	6645 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private								
Received:	May,07,2010 09:19:02								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the								
correspondence.	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to								
	provide greater pedestrian access.								
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:								
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only								
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a								
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be								
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan								
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well solutions are apprecised on the potential of the seashore to realize them.								
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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								
lame: Received:	private 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.

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6647 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 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 wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
	· · ·
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6648 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:03 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a channed to its traditional numbers and diversity within the pack.
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well.
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
forrespondence ID:	6649 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
ame: eceived:	private May,07,2010 09:19:07
orrespondence Type:	Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6650 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:07 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6651 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 09:19:07 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred". Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to readend in this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife rentered plan fails to set aside adequate a
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6652 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative 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.

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6653 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 09:19:07
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6654 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:07 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resourc
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6655 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 09:19:08 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6656 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:19:08 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	 me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6657 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:08
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be divertione and wintering reacies areades and advente measurement to realiz
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6658 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access
	provide 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.

Correspondence ID:	6659 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 09:19:13 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6660 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07.2010 09:19:13 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Stablish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6661 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 accamodate 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.

Correspondence ID: Name:	private	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y		
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:19:13 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								
	*Provide Ec 16 of the 68 least half of approach we chance to re * Put Natura consistent w migrating, a are minimum * Establish a managemen degraded ab implemente as breeding Thank you f	qual Access f total miles of the beach sh ould provide bound to its al Resources with this prot- and wintering ms and shou and Meet Cl- at targets in the bilities. When d until recov- for the oppor	for All Visi of Seashore nould be av balanced a traditional First. Prot ection. The g species. V ld be increa ear Goals f he DEIS, th re birds, tun rery goals a tunity to p	itors. Under the Na e beach. This does ailable year round access for all visito numbers and diver ection of the nature preferred plan fail Vildlife protection ased if necessary to for Wildlife Recoven hey need more thou tles, and plants are are met. These goal	tional Park a not represent for non-OR rs. Pedestria sity within t al resources s to set asid must be base protect breary. A plan r ough vetting not coming s, and adequ ents. I will t	Service's prefer t a fair balance V users and wi ns and families he park. and wildlife of e adequate area ed on the best s eding birds and nust include cle g based on the p back as planne iate manageme	ar goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are otential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its d, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures sh at to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering spect progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to	e park, at ties, this d have a e reeding, erred plan e recent hould be ies as wel	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,201 Web Form I appreciate alternative p provide grez This alterna me. No matter w * Put Natura consistent w * Establish i managemen degraded ab	the opportun- plans present ater pedestria tive plan wo which alterna al Resources with this prot- and Meet Cl- at targets in the pilities.	ed in the d an access. uld provide tive is chos First. Prot ection. ear Goals f he DEIS, th	raft environmental e more opportunity sen it is important f ection of the natura for Wildlife Recoven hey need more thom	impact state for non-OR hat the follo al resources ery. A plan r ough vetting	ment, I suppor V uses of the b wing be observ and wildlife of nust include cle g based on the p	Y plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashor the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if m eaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are im ed carefully. the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be ar goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are otential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its p enatural resources of the Seashore.	nodified to aportant to e e	
Correspondence ID:	6664 I	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y Y		
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:19:13				nodified to aportant to d on only park, at tites, this d have a e reeding, erred plan e recent nould be				

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

Correspondence: The spectrum is to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plus to manage QRV use on QPW use of the sensitive "invironmental proferent" A provide graat pedactrian access. The spectra of the spectrum of the interfield "environmental integer statement, 1 support the identified and the statement of the sense of the statement of the sense of the statement of the statement of the sense of the statement of the sense of the statement of the statement of the sense of the statement of the statement of the sense of the statement of the statement of the sense of the statement of the statement of the statement of the statement of the sense of the statement of t		
Carrespondence: ************************************	Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:19:14
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-OKV uses of the beaches and result in loss disturbance of wild in memory of the provide ingradiants of the other based on the based based of the based of the based based based of the based based based of the based based of the based bas		I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified
The following principles should madepin the park's formulation of its final plan, should in of choose to each Alternative F. "Provide Equal Access for All Visions. Under the National Park Services preferred plan, Allenative F. ORVS would be print by the Scababor." "In Standard Metan Services Stars, Parkation Stars and the formulation and withing. Contained with more vulnessys and be channes to the scalable plan for and on the own withing of the Scababor." "In Standard Metan Services Stars, Parkation Stars and Starssing within the profile of the Scababore should core first, and recension consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORVs were around to vulne plan withing on the Scababore should core first, and recension consistent with the protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORVs were should core first, and recension of the starsteres. The Scababor and Mete Clear Grashs and Mete Clear Grashs and Mete Clear Grashs and Mete Clear Grashs and Scababor and the plan fails to set aside adequate areas threads the scababore singert with first prevention to previous the protein the DFIS, they neel more through withing based on the pontinuit of the Scababore support wildlife recovery, management torgets in the DFIS, they neel more through withing based for and the Scababore stars and wildlife. Context, and the Scababore stars and wildlife Context, and the Scababore and the scababore stars and the scababore stars and wildlife. The Scababore stars and wildlife the Scababore stars and wildlife context, and the scababore stars and wildlife context. Correspondence ID: GG6 Project: 10611 Document: 32296 Private: Y Private: Y Private:		This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
Name: private Recrived: May,07,2010 09:19:14 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatterns N atternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" A provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildli ne. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D. "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be provide balanced access for all visitors. Prodestrians and families could the more safely enjoy the Seashore, a chance to rebond to its ritiditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Paut Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be available part of the seashore should core of RV use year round for will in protection. The preferred plan fails to set side adequate areas that are free of RV use year orand for will migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the potential of the Seashore is support wildlife rate and adequate management to realize the photony wildlife rate access to your core breading through sand and milestones for wildlife recovery: management targes in the DISS, they need more through vetting based on the potential of the Seashore is support wildlife rate and balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. Correspondence TD;		*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
 May 07.2010 09:19:14 Correspondence: May 07.2010 09:19:14 Correspondence: Lapreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatterss N alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement. I support the identified "environmentally preferred" A provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plans would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildli re. The following principles should anderpin the park's formulation of its final plan, Atternative F. ORVs would be prohol to of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance far other users and wildlife. If ORVs uses ial least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. One Seashore should how any other data constitution of its final plan, Atternative F. ORVs would be proteen to would provide balanced access for all visitors. The destination and families could the more safely enjoy the Seashore, a dance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should provide within firs protection. The prefered plan fails to set as also adequeat areas that are free of ORV use year round for wild ingrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best sciential of the Seashore to support wildlife its recovery. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and millstones for wildlife recovery. * May 07.2010 09:19:18 Correspondence ID: 6607 Form Correspondence ID: 6607 Form Correspondence ID: 6607 Form Correspondence ID: Form Forwide Faul Access for All Visitors. Under the hadit environmental impact statement, I support the identified "	Correspondence ID:	6666 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras N alternative plans prostend in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" A provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildli me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be profi- l 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 be approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, a chance to rebound to its raditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife. Combined with more warlways and be are minimums and should be increased in fencessary to protect breeding brids and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery: management targets in the DEIS, they need more thoroque hveting based on the post-and to the Seashore source) working the seashore support wildfifer as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras an balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. Correspondence Type: Correspondence Type: Correspondence Type: May 07.2010 09:19:18 Correspondence Type via the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras N alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statemen		1
 atternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" A provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildli me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should in not choose to enact Alternative D. "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F. ORVs would be profit be approach. Would provide balanced access of all visitors. Pedestrians and similies could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, a, chance to rebound to its trafitional numbers and diversity within the park. "Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreasion consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wild migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance bu are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turbles. " Estabilish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery: management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife and balance access. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. Correspondence Type Web form Tappreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage OKV use on Cape Hatteras Na talemative plans would provide balan		Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, Alternative P. ORVs would be profile for the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is all least half of the beach should be approach would provide balanced access for all visions. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First, Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreation consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wild it migraring, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance bu are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery, management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rate of the experimentation of the seashore to support wildlife recovery. The private targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on annual reviews, additional protect implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and as breeding ones. Correspondence ID: 6667 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y Receivedi May, 07, 2010 09:19:18 Korrespondence in the dardt environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally		alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified
 *Provide Equil Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be proh l6 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. I CoNV use is all least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and be approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreation consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for will migrating, and wintering species. Wildliff protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildliff disturbance bu are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildliff. Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildliffer accovery: management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildliffer accovery: management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore. Correspondence ID: 6667 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y Name: May (07,2010 09:19:18 Correspondencer Type: Web Form I Correspondencer Type: Web Form I Laprociate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras N alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" A provide great predestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for		
Correspondence ID: 6667 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y Name: may,07,2010 09:19:18 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 N alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" A provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildli me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be proh 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is all least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and be approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Under the Nations. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreation consistent with this protecies. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance bu are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding bir		 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as work.
Name: private Received: May.07,2010 09:19:18 Correspondence Type: Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras N alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" A provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" A provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlime. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be proh 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is all least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and bet approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreation consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wild migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. W		balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
 Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras N alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" A provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildli me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohi 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is all least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and bet approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreation consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wild migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance bu are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife recovery. Management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on annual review	Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:19:18
me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be proh 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is all least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and bet approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreation consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wild migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance bu are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife ra degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protec implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and		I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access.
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohilo for the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is all least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and be approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreation consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wild migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance bu are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife ra degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protec implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and 		me.
implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and		*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent
		implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6668 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:18
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6669 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:19 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t 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: Name: Received:	6670 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:19
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative 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 we as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6671 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:19 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

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

Correspondence ID:	6672 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private May 07 2010 00:10:10
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:19:19 Web Form
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ractory. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6674 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:19 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

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

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

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

Correspondence ID:	6675 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private 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 recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:19:24 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
correspondencer	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t
	provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following miniples should under in the module formulation of its final plan, should it not should be most Alternative Di
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this
	approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6677 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are 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
	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 establish

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.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6678 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:24
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rare minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
Correspondence ID: Name:	6679 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:19:24 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6680 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:24 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 Ser alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact stat provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-OF me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent least half of the beach should be available year round for non-OR approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestri- chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set asid migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Protection must be bas are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect bre * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vettin degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adeq as breeding ones.	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6682 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:25 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife net draing nare minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need
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
 alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Al provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlit the majority of visitors. *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohi 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 beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access fa would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreation consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wild migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife radegraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protect implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and severing and as breeding ones. 	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until re
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6685 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:30 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migratin
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

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

provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID:	6687 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private 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.
	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.
The following j *Provide Equal 16 of the 68 tot least half of the approach would chance to rebou * Put Natural R consistent with migrating, and are minimums * Establish and management ta	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID:	6688 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:19:30 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6689 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:30 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 alternative plans presented in the draft environm provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportione. The following principles should underpin the pither for the following principles should underpin the pither for the following principles should underpin the pither for the following principles should be available year approach would provide balanced access for all chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the consistent with this protection. The preferred pl migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife prote are minimums and should be increased if neces * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife H management targets in the DEIS, they need mo degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and pla implemented until recovery goals are met. Thes as breeding ones.	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6691 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private: May.07,2010 09:19:35 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be probibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more horough vetting based on the beats cientific information. Wildlife inster than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional pro
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.

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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants a
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6694 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07.2010 09:19:35 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migr
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.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6696 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:35 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rare minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6697 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 1 appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative 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 as ide adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife in
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6698 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:41

Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6699 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:41 Web Form I I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at
	 least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6700 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection on the castural accources and wildlife of the Seashore should core wildlife rickulting precise. * Put Natural Resources first, urtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be incr
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6701 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:41

	0010755
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife reacter accent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, a
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6702 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 09:19:41 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore bound for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6703 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plans vould provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife rate than on its recent degraded abilit
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6704 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:41

	0010756
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID:	6705 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May.07.2010 09:19:41
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Etablish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife racher than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6706 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:19:46 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

 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.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6708 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:47 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6709 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:47 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Name:	private
Received:	May,07,2010 09:19:47
Correspondence Type:	Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportu

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID:	6711 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received:	May,07,2010 09:19:47 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: Name:	6713 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 09:19:47
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important
	 me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the oppo
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6714 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:47 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:19:52 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl I of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degra
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6716 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00
orrespondence Type: orrespondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative 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 suppose to 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 we
	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.
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6717 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:52 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and mildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred pla are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6718 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:52 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
correspondence.	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plans would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important t me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6719 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private: May,07,2010 09:19:52 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails tos et aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Statbilsh and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turt
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6720 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:52 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First, Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of NRV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea t
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6721 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:52 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. Pleaseonce 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6722 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:54 Web Form 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 citzens out of their National Seashore RECREATION Area; or whatever else the alleged "environmentals" tell you to do. Just for the record I did not agree the consent decree either. Nevin Thomas

Correspondence ID: Name:	6723 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private Marce 07 2010 00:10:58
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:19:58 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degrad
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6724 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 prestine wildlife and in the end, ours as well. Nature is the only true connection to peace and balance thave, 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
	approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6725 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:58
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6726 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:58
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ractovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife ather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6727 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:58 Web Form 1 appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6728 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:19:58 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6729 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Addit: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May, 07,2010 09:19:58 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildliffe Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife retare than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming based on the potential of the Seas
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6730 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:03 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and viallife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent to the turt of the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent to the turt of the date of the seashore to support wildlife rather han on
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID:	6732 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:20:03
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering sp
Correspondence ID:	6733 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:20:03 Web Form
Correspondence ID:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be increased in necessary to protect breeding birds and se
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6734 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:03 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6735 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:04
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6736 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:04 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife rotection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimus and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildliffe Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6737 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:10 Web Form
Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 09:20:10 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the na
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6739 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:10 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This 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 statement of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife.
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	 Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more through vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6740 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:10
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

C	CTALL Deviced 10CAL Descented 2050C Deletator V
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6741 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide 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 minimise 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 consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums a
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6742 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:10 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 assult on nature. Please consider a complete ban of their use. If not, then adopting an aletenative 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 including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife fercovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented unti
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6743 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:10 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft anyironmental impact statement. Leuport the identified "anyironmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6744 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:16 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred pla are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6745 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:16 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This 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 statement of the statement of the statement.
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6746 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:16 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified

provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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 t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implem
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 6748 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 09:20:16 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and mildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV us year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best
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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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 Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as br
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6751 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:17 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rether than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on the postential of the Seashore to support wil
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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6753 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:21 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be imple
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6754 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 Recov
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6755 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:22 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:20:22
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent
	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6758 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:22
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

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

Correspondence ID:	6759 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 09:20:27 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Correspondence ID:	6760 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:20:27
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
correspondence.	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breading 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: Name: Received:	6761 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:27
Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6762 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:20:27 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be impreceded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6763 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:20:27 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
Correspondence ID:	6764 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:20:32
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

Correspondence ID:	6765 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 09:20:32 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resourc
Correspondence ID:	6766 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private 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: Name:	6767 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received:	May,07,2010 09:20:32
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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.

Correspondence ID:	6768 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:20:32
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects
	balanced final plan for an visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seasifice.
Correspondence ID:	6769 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resourc
Correspondence ID:	6770 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:20:33
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	 me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6771 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:20:33 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Common on domos IDs	· · ·
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:20:33
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a character action to the traction of the park.
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6773 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:20:38
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

Correspondence ID:	6774 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 09:20:38 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more how how for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will b
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6775 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:38:14 Web Form 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, kiters have a little extra coin. They make great tourists. Last, it is a clean, quiet sport.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6776 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:40:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6777 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:40:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6778 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:40:27 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goa
Correspondence ID:	6779 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:40:27
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6780 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 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 orpresent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and families could then more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must in

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6781 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:40:27					
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 09:40:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6782 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07.2010 09:40:27 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative plan would provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for on-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6783 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 09:40:32 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degrade					
Correspondence ID: Name:	6784 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private					

 Name:
 private.

 Received:
 May,07,2010 09:40:32

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6785 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:40:32 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and millife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goal
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6786 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:40:37 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors: Predestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include c
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6787 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:40:37 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6788 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07.2010 09:40:37
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6789 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 09:40:37 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underprin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore buffer in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6790 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 09:40:37 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORV swould be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet C

	0010704
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:40:42 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and awildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6792 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 09:40:43 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be adcess for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and shoul
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6793 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 09:40:48 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are mi
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6794 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:40:48 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

Correspondence ID:	6795 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y					
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:40:48					
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent deg					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6796 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:40:48 Web Form					
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where b					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6797 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:40:53 Web Form I Image: Comparison of the state of the s					

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

lame: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:						
	private May,07,2010 09:40:53					
	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should					
Correspondence ID: Jame: Received: Correspondence Type:	6799 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:40:54 Web Form					
'orrespondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breaden, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife reavery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS					
Correspondence ID:	6800 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private					
	Provide and a second					
ame: Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:40:59 Web Form					

Correspondence ID.	0001	Troject.	10041	Document.	52590	1 11 vai
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2	2010 09:40:59				
Correspondence Type:	Web For	m				

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

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

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

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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 breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6802 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:40:59 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include cle
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6803 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 09:40:59 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan vould provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors: vedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife information. Wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be increased if necessary to
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6804 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6805 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private					
Received:	May,07,2010 09:41:05					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities.					
Common dance ID:	6806 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y					
Correspondence ID: Name:	6806 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 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 an					
	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. Jun					
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which					
	was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the					
	beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.					
	The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:					
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only					
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at					
	least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this					
	approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.					
	Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten					
	with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are					
	minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.					
	Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we 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 consister					
	with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating,					
	and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are					
	minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are					
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent					
	management argets in the DEDs, they need note through vering based on the potential of the Seasifier to support whither father than 101105 feeding					

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6808 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:06 Wob Form					
Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife racher date margement targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate man					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6809 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:06 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which					
	 was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and win					
Correspondence ID:	6810 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y					
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:41:06 Web Form 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 backgreater backgreater pedestrian access.					
	beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.					
Correspondence ID: Name:	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.

Correspondence ID:	6812 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y				
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 09:41:11 Web Form				
Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrati				
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6813 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:12				
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the				
	beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.				
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6814 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:12 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which				
	was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.				

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6815 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07.2010 09:41:12 Web Formation: 32596 Private: Y gaprocide Hogo 010 09:41:12 Web Formation: Y Y gaprocide He opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources F
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6816 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07.2010 09:41:12 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore buffe disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are first protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and winteri
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6817 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 09:41:17 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the pote

	0010732
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6818 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:17 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until r
Correspondence ID:	6819 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	May,07,2010 09:41:17
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID:	6820 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:41:17
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID:	6821 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	May,07,2010 09:41:17
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which use identified in the DEIS or the anticomparately performed elementing alternative plan would provide appreciate pedestrian access, which

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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: Name: Received:	6822 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:23
InterventCorrespondenceCorrespondence:I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras Nati alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohil 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is al least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and be approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreationa with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife inclu and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife re 	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6823 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:23
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife roleding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not com
Correspondence ID:	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. 6824 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:41:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent

with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

Correspondence ID:	6825 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:41:23
Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather tha
Correspondence ID:	6826 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:41:24 Web Form 1 appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underprin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for ono-ORV users and avilldlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6827 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 09:41:24 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan muu

	0010795
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6828 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:24 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the
	was definited in the DEB as the chylotinited and prevented antennative plan would provide inore opportunity for holi-OKV dass of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6829 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:41:24 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and dividife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its rece
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6830 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:30
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wint
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6831 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:30 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6832 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:30
Correspondence: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, addition
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6833 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:30 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targe
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6834 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:30 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, an

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

Correspondence ID:	6835 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:41:36
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for w
Correspondence ID:	6836 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence Type: 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 possiblity 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 noisey activities.
	Access facilities and equal access planning should be consistent with overall planning to PROTECT our important barrier islands and Atlantic coastlin I suggest that access facilites and walkway building need not be expanded, just improve those that already exsist. 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 consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ractory. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we
	as breeding ones.]
Correspondence ID:	6837 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private 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, a least helf of the beach should be quailed a variant of the other other access facilities, this
	least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consiste with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are
	minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as w as breeding ones.

	0010798
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:41:36 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underprin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for ono-ORV users and avildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate man
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6839 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:42 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors: Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the bet scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clar goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where bi
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6840 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:42 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6841 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:42 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include cl
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6842 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:42

	0010799
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and dividife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID:	6843 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 09:41:42 Web Form
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of Reseashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6844 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 09:41:42
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The prefered plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until re
Correspondence ID:	6845 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:41:47 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6846 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:47 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery go
Correspondence ID:	6847 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received:	May,07,2010 09:41:47
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6848 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:52 Web Form 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
Correspondence:	National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greaters pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: Name:	6849 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 09:41:53
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as
Correspondence ID:	6850 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May.07.2010 09:41:53
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until re
Correspondence ID:	6851 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Correspondence Type: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 09:41:53 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this compresent would provide the part of poly informed predering on the fourier on a difference on a wild then present on one would then present and wildlife or out how the statement and wildlife or out how the statement and wildlife or out how the statement of a wildlife or out how the statement of a wildlife or out how the statement access facilities, this compresent wild be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. The statement access facilities, this compresent wild be available year for all wildlife. The statement of the present of a wildlife or out how the statement of the statement of the statement of a wildlife or out how the statement of thow the statement of the statement of
	approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6852 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:41:58
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6853 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:43:19
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Way, 07, 2010 (07.45.19) Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife racher than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6854 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:43:19 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife racter than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as bre
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6855 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:43:19 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This 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 following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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
Possived:	May,07,2010 09:43:19
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where bi
Correspondence ID:	6857 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received:	May,07,2010 09:43:19
Correspondence Type:	Web Form
Correspondence:	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and viallife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals ar
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

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

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

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

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

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

	6859 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:43:39
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded
Correspondence ID: Name:	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 6860 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:43:39 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on on 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a pproach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented unt
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6861 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:43:39 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6862 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 09:43:39
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this
	approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife racovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6863 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:43:51 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implem
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6864 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:43:51 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This 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 following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6865 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:43:51 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6866 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:43:51 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6867 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:43:51
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This 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 following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6868 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
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 the second statement.
	provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative 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 pla are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:44:02
Correspondence Type:	Web Form
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These go
Correspondence ID:	6870 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private 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 provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important time.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6871 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:44:02 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6872 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private 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 t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6873 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t 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

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: Name: Received:	6874 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:44:16
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 fina plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6875 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 09:44:16 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding bidrs and sea turtles. * Establish a
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6876 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 09:44:17 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding.

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private 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: Received:	private 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 09:44:21
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide groups production access.
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 09:44:21 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6881 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6882 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:10:30 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6883 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 10:10:30 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental import statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental import statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental import statement, I support Alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional prote
Correspondence ID:	6884 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 private May,07,2010 10:10:35 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife racluding breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A p
Correspondence ID: Name:	6885 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 10:10:36 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there a
Correspondence ID: Name:	6886 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private

 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: Name: Received:	6887 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:10:41
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, addition
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6888 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 10:10:41 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildli
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6889 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:10:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

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

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

Correspondence ID:	6890 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 10:10:46
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent deg
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6891 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 10:10:47 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife information. Wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6892 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:10:47 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection on the baset aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife receiving, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6893 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:10:47
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as
Correspondence ID:	6894 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Correspondence ID: Name:	6894 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 10:10:47 Web Form
	 was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wint
Correspondence ID:	6895 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 10:10:47
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at paroach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additio
Correspondence ID:	6896 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May 07 2010 10:10:52
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 10:10:52 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6897 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:10:52 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. T
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6898 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:10:53 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore build for wildlife protecting must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals a
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6899 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:10:53 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6900 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 10:10:53 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating,
	and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6901 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 10:10:58 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore build for which is increated in necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wi
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6902 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:10:58
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent de
Correspondence ID:	6903 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y

Received:

Correspondence:

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6904 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:10:58 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a pproach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore build come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abiliti
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6905 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:10:58 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors: Predestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round first in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ractory. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Se
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6906 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:10:59 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6907 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 10:10:59
Correspondence: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rether than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals
Correspondence ID:	6908 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private 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: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence:	Web Form 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 10:11:04
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife of the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on
Correspondence ID: Name:	6911 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 10:11:04 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and win
Correspondence ID:	6912 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 10:11:09 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where bi
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6913 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:11:10 Y

	0010021
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID:	6914 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received:	May,07,2010 10:11:10
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	 was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and win
Correspondence ID:	6915 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private May 07 2010 10:11:10
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 10:11:10 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where b
Correspondence ID:	6916 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private 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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6917 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:11:15 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until r
Correspondence ID:	6918 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 10:11:15 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6919 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May.07,2010 10:11:15 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only I6 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protectio

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: Name:	6920 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 10:11:15 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures shoul
Correspondence ID:	6921 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May.07.2010 10:11:20
	 was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and win
Correspondence ID:	6922 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 10:11:20 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife rather than on its recent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on it
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6923 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:11:20
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6924 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:11:21 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 recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measure
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6925 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:11:21 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering spe
	minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6926 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:11:26 Web Form
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent

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

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 10:11:26
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife recetorery to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additio
Correspondence ID:	6928 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 10:11:26
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until
Correspondence ID: Name:	6929 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 10:11:26 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recen

Is there nowhere we don't need to drive?

as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6930 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:11:29
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtl
Correspondence ID:	6931 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6931 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:11:32
Correspondence:	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until re
Correspondence ID:	6932 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May.07,2010 10:11:32 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather t
Correspondence ID:	6933 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private 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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6934 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 10:11:32 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and mailies could then more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlif
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. 6935 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:11:32 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
Correspondence:	 Tappretate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's project plan to manage OKV use on Cape Platter as National Seasible. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measu
Correspondence ID: Name:	6936 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private Mm: 07 2010 10.11.22

Received: May,07,2010 10:11:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form Correspondence: I appreciate

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6937 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:13:24 Web Form Papreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D. *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife retovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the best clear fools and annula reviews, additional protective measures shou
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 6938 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:13:24 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include c
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6939 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 10:13:24 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, a

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6940 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:13:24 Web Farm
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will
Company and an as The	6941 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Correspondence ID: Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 10:13:40 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at
	least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6942 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:13:40 V
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this preferred plan, this prediction areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breading.
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	6943 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 10:13:40 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the n
Correspondence ID:	6944 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 10:13:40 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the n
Correspondence ID: Name:	6945 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 10:13:51
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 thar 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: Name: Received:	6946 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:13:57
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6947 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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: Name:	6948 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 10:13:58 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6949 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:13:58 Web Form
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6950 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07.2010 10:13:58
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6951 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:14:04
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6952 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important t 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we 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: Name: Received:	6953 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:14:05
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This 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 following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the na
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6954 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:14:05 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be

6955 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May 07,2010 10:14:05 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative P. (ORVs would be prohibited year round on only for othe 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair halance for othen users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and adive adia dequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the prefered plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birtis and seaturtes. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones to supont wildlife rather than on its recent degrade
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to mee. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Predestrinas and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more coming back is a planned, based on annual reviews, additional predective measures should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. The DEI
me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORV's would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access fail visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources' proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I sup
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORV's would be prohibited year round on only I fo of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the bost. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species. # Establish and Meet Clear Goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species. # Establish and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras National Seash
migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 6956 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:14:05 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only
management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 6956 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:14:05 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only
balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 6956 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:14:05 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only
private May,07,2010 10:14:05 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only
least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be
consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we
as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
6957 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
May,07,2010 10:14:11 Web Form
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan rain the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are
management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6958 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 10:14:11
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 totalally 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 ono-ORV users and avilable. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establi
	· · ·
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6959 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:14:11 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to the identified "environmental statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to the identified "environmental statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to the identified "environmental statement, I support the identif
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the n
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6960 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:14:11
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May, 07,2010 FORMERT I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a five balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as plann

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6961 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:14:11
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the n
Correspondence ID:	6962 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 10:14:11
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	6963 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Rane: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 10:14:11 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6964 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:20:06
Correspondence:	Web Form 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 publ 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6965 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Gless, Wayne Apr,25,2010 00:00:00 Letter
Correspondence:	I would like to comment to the NPS (DEIS) which I feel is flawed. Some point in particular that I strongly disagree with. I disagree with the routes and areas. Why has NPS never made public a list of reported incidents? On page 210 no piping plover deaths have been attributed to general ORV's. Most of all cases have involved NPS ORV's. I disagree with closures due to birds; I disagree with the killing or capture of other native animals to save birds. Why close massive areas when only 3% of interference is attributed to humans whether in an ORV or pedestrian. Cultural/historical values, I disagree with the DEIS when they only have 2 paragraphs out of the 800 page document devoted to this. 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. There is incomplete data since they did not use data from the first full year of the consent decree (2009). 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). Why was alternative F attributed to the advisory committee? Whom the negative regulation was discontinued.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6966 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Powell, Robin Apr,25,2010 00:00:00 Letter Attn: Mike Murray Cape Hatteras National Seashore - 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. Wh 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). Robin Powell P.O. Box 636 Buxton, North Carolina 27920
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6967 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Camp, Patricia Apr,25,2010 00:00:00 Letter 50242 Timber Trail Frisco, NC 27936 April 25, 2010 Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Mantee NC 27954 Dear Mr. Murray, In the DEIS NPS Preferred Alterative 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. Sincerette Detricing Comm Sincerette Detricing Comm
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Sincerely, Patricia Camp 6968 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Camp, Patricia Apr,25,2010 00:00:00 Letter 50242 Timber Trail Frisco, NC 27936 April 25, 2010 Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Mantee NC 27954 Dear Mr. Murray, The DEIS NPS Preferred Alterative 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! Sincerely, Patricia Camp
Correspondence ID:	6060 Project. 10641 Document. 32506

Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Giannatti, Nancy Apr,25,2010 00:00:00 Letter 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 that 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6970 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Griffin, Merrill and Larry T Apr,24,2010 00:00:00 Letter 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6971 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Griffin, Merrill and Larry T Apr,24,2010 00:00:00 Letter 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6972 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 DiTondo, Mike Apr,22,2010 00:00:00 Letter 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 1 purchased a house in 1986 and then RETIRED HERE in 1999. Main reason is 1 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6973 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Sheffield, Jim Apr.25,2010 00:00:00 Letter 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, 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 bras and turtles or humanity. I respectively ask is there not a reasonable way to give access to the ent

	0010839
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6974 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:34:44 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6975 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Bough, Joe Apr,25,2010 00:00:000 Letter Please keep our beaches open and free there is room for fisherman and birds and turtles. Document: 32596
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6976 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Sharp, Bob and Becky Apr,25,2010 00:00:00 Letter
Correspondence Type: 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 thei 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6977 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Granger, Dave J May,07,2010 10:37:55 Web Form
	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 publi 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: Name: Received:	6978 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Wright Jr., Robert L Apr,20,2010 00:00:00 Letter
Correspondence Type: 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Smithson, Dale Apr,25,2010 00:00:00 Letter 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6980 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:40:49 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and mildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6981 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 10:40:50 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and winter
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6982 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 10:40:50 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental impact statement, I support Alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underprin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access failties, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areast that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6983 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:40:51
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, whic was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of th beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisted with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife racted plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective
Correspondence ID: Name:	6984 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 10:40:51 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, whice was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisted with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather tha
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6985 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:40:54 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, whic was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisted with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6986 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:14 Web Form

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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	6987 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:14 Web Form				
Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities.				
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6988 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:16 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include cle				
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6989 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:16 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at				

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

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

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 10:41:16
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6991 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 10:41:21 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wint
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6992 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 10:41:21 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for on-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species.

Correspondence ID:	6993 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y		
Name: Received:	May.07,2010 10:41:22		
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should corem first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlif		
Correspondence ID:	6994 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y		
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	private		
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 10:41:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underprin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and dividlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its rec		
Correspondence ID:	6995 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y		
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 10:41:27		
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,201010:41:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include c		
Correspondence ID.			
Correspondence ID: Name:	6996 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private		
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 10:41:27 Web Form		
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which		

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	6997 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:27 Y
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rat
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6998 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 10:41:28 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore build in cluding breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Re
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	6999 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, an

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

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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: Name:	7000 Project: 10641 private	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Received:	May,07,2010 10:41:33				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to com alternative plans presented in the d was identified in the DEIS as the e beaches and result in less disturbar The following principals should um Provide Equal Access for All Visit 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore least half of the beach should be av approach would provide balanced chance to rebound to its traditional Put Natural Resources First: Protec with this protection. The preferred and wintering species. Wildlife pro minimums and should be increased Establish and Meet Clear Goals for management targets in the DEIS, tu degraded abilities. Where birds, tur	aft environmental im vironmentally prefer- ce of wildlife, which derpin the park's form rrs: Under the Nation beach. This does not allable year round for ccess for all visitors. numbers and diversit ion of the natural res- olan fails to set aside ection must be based if necessary to prote- Wildlife Recovery: <i>I</i> ey need more thorou les and plants are no	apact staten red alterna are import nulation of lal Park Sen t represent r non-ORV Pedestrian y within th sources and adequate a d on the bes ct breeding A plan mus gh vetting t coming b	hent, I support A tive. This altern ant to me. its final plan, s vice's preferrece a fair balance for users and wild s and families of e park. wildlife of the reas that are free the scientific infor birds and sea t t include clear g based on the po ack as planned,	to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which hative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the hould it not choose to enact Alternative D: d plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only or other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at llife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten ee of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, ormation. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are urtles. goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are tential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent , based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be t to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we

	0010847	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7001 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 10:41:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be probibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, mi	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7002 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:34 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which	
 was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity f beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibit 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allo least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and bett approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, an chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife includit and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the p minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rat degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protectivi implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and as breeding ones. 		
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7003 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:34 Web Form Y	
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where b	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7004 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:41 Web Form I In appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:	

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7005 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y			
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 10:41:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recen			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7006 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May.07,2010 10:41:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and beter access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore build in rounding precies. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7007 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:47 Web Form I I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating,			

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

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 10:41:47	
ReferenceCorrespondence Type: Correspondence:Correspondence:I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras Nationa alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pee was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative D if modified to provide greater pee was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative D if modified to provide greater pee was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. 		
Correspondence ID: Name:	7009 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private	
Received:	May,07,2010 10:41:47	
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as	
Correspondence ID:	7010 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y	
Name:	private	
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 10:41:48 Web Form	
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7011 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:53	

	0010850
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife racher than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea utrules. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on i
Correspondence ID:	7012 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Correspondence ID: Name:	private
Received:	May,07,2010 10:41:53
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7013 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:53 10
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of ORV use year round for wildlife protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7014 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:53 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7015 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:59 Web Form Y				
Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities.				
Correspondence ID:	7016 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y				
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the				
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:				
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering 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 set urtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.				
Correspondence ID: Name:	7017 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private				
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 10:41:59 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its rece				

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7018 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:59		
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back a		
Correspondence ID:	7019 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y		
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 10:41:59 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective meas		
Correspondence ID:	7020 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y		
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 10:41:59		
	7021 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:41:59 Web Form		
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of t alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access,		

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence: Corresponde			
We all low Some folk I am 87 ye look forw Everyone Sincerely 7023 private Received: May,07,20 Correspondence Type: Web Forn I apprecia alternative was identi beaches a The follow Provide E I 6 of the 0 least half approach chance to Put Natura with this p and winte Establish i managem degraded i implemen as breedin	tiate the opportunity to con- ive plans presented in the op- ntified in the DEIS as the op- and result in less disturba- lowing principals should u- Equal Access for All Visi e 68 total miles of Seashou for the beach should be as the would provide balanced to rebound to its traditiona- ural Resources First: Prote s protection. The preferrec- tering species. Wildlife pr ms and should be increased h and Meet Clear Goals for ment targets in the DEIS, d abilities. Where birds, tt ented until recovery goals	draft environmental environmentally pre- nce of wildlife, whi nderpin the park's fi tors: Under the Nat re beach. This does vailable year round access for all visito al numbers and dive ction of the natural plan fails to set asi otection must be ba d if necessary to pro- ror Wildlife Recover- they need more thou urtles and plants are	formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: tional Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at d for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this ors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
We all lov Some folk I am 87 ye look forwa Everyone	tiate the opportunity to con- ive plans presented in the op- ntified in the DEIS as the op- and result in less disturba- lowing principals should u- Equal Access for All Visi e 68 total miles of Seashould be a the would provide balanced to rebound to its traditiona- ural Resources First: Prote- s protection. The preferrec- tering species. Wildlife pr ms and should be increased h and Meet Clear Goals for ment targets in the DEIS, d abilities. Where birds, tu ented until recovery goals	draft environmental environmentally pre- nce of wildlife, whi nderpin the park's fi- tors: Under the Nat re beach. This does vailable year round access for all visito al numbers and dive cition of the natural plan fails to set asi otection must be ba d if necessary to pro- ro Wildlife Recover- they need more thou urtles and plants are	formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: tional Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at d for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this ors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
Received:Apr,22,20Correspondence:LetterApril 22, 27	ove the beach and we wan olks go off the deep end w	t to help you in the hen they don't get the	32596 ng with us ? property owners in Kmashat Shores. Park Service. heir way. Just help us all you can to save our beach. nymore. So when my kid's come to take me in their four wheel drive cars do to the beach. I rally

	0010034
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Apr,21,2010 00:00:00 Letter 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 no 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: Name:	7026 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
	bullied multiplan for an visitors multipleters are natural resources of the beasilore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:43:29 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its rec
Correspondence ID:	7028 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 10:43:29 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should undernin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7029 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:43:34 V
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects t
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7030 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:43:34 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F. ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should core differs in the preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and miles for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the poten
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7031 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 10:43:34 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	7032 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 10:43:35 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the n
Correspondence ID:	7033 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 00:000 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife only. Combined 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7034 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:43:35 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative 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.

Correspondence ID: Name:	7035 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
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
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a
	chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding. Migrating, and wintering species.
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	7036 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 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 pc 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, an 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 transfer and the total chick total chick and the other total shall be readed.
	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 speci 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:
	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 closur found anywhere in the United States. The reasons behind using such in CHNSRA, and not in locations where species like PIPL are actually endangere 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 pla

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 exclosures 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 us, 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 CHSNRA, 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 DIES, 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, beanbag 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 les 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.

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 of 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: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 10:43:50 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important i me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7038 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:43:50
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important t me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	7039 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received:	May,07,2010 10:43:50

	0010860
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife reactive. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual review
Correspondence ID: Name:	7040 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 10:43:50 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 whould 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 them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlift Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planneed,
Correspondence ID: Name:	7041 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 10:43:50 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the best scientific information. Wildlife frather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additi
Correspondence ID:	7042 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y

Correspondence ID:	7042	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						

	0010861
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May.07,2010 10:43:58 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degrad
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7043 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:43:58 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. "* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, mig
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7044 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:43:58 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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. Pleaseno ORV's all the year through on the 68 miles of Seashore beach at Cape Hatteras. Thank you.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7045 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:43:58 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migratin

migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

0010861

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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:	7046 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 10:44:04
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ractovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife and in its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be foll
Correspondence ID:	7047 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 10:44:04 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abiliti
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7048 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 10:44:04 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and millife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7049 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:44:04 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7050 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 permiting system for locals?) If you choose poorly here, we will find some place else to take our tourism dollarsJAK This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private 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: Name: Received:	7052 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:44:23

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resource								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7054 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 10:44:25 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore bould for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan mus								
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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7056 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Schwester, E J Apr,23,2010 00:00:00 Letter 4000000000000000000000000000000000000			
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 stimulu 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7057 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Halstein, Francis Apr,25,2010 00:00:00 Letter 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7058 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 Me			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7059 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 McNair, Lynn May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7060 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Thompson, Jasen May,07,2010 11:00:29 Web Form 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 noticable 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 repect and use the beach without harming the wildlife.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7061 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:10:02 Web Form Because the Park service Land borders the villages of Hatteras Iasland, 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7062Project:10641Document:32596Private:YMay.07,2010 11:10:37Web FormI appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7063 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:10:37 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, an

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7064 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:10:38
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for w
Correspondence ID:	7065 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 11:10:38
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at parts of the other access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name:	7066 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 11:10:43 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather th
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7067 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7068 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:10:49 Web Form
Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only
	16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating,
	and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7069 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:10:49
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7070 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:10:49 Web Form I Intervention of the addition addition of the addition of the additin the addition of the addition addition addith
	approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 11:10:49
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, addition
Correspondence ID:	7072 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 11:10:49 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures sh
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7073 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:10:49 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

 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: Name: Received:	7075 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07.2010 11:10:54
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent de
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7076 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 11:10:55 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessa
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7077 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 11:10:55 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May.07,2010 11:11:00 Veb Form Veb Form Veb Form appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which weas identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if nec
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7079 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:11:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildliffe Recovery: A plan must include c
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Orage Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:11:00 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORV's would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering sp

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7081 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:11:00 Y
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as
Correspondence ID.	7082 Project. 106/1 Document. 22506 Drivetor V
Correspondence ID: Name:	7082 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 11:11:06
	 was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wint
Correspondence ID:	7083 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received:	May,07,2010 11:11:06
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID:	7084 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private May 07 2010 11:11:06
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 11:11:06 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the

alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7085 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 11:11:11 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at proach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rethered plan are Establis
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7086 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07.2010 11:11:11 House 1000000000000000000000000000000000000
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7087 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 11:11:12 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and winter

minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7088 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:11:12 Velocity
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7089 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 ithe 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 consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7090 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, a
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7091 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:11:17 Web Form Internative plans presented in the draft environment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7092 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:11:17 Web Form
Correspondence:	 I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and mildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife rather than on its recent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than
Correspondence ID:	7093 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 11:11:17 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7094 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:11:23 Web Form I I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and smillies could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent minimums and shoul

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: Name:	7095 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 11:11:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a pproach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent d
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7096 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 11:11:24 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental lay preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recover
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7097 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 11:12:37 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7098 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 11:13:38 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a pproach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be i

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

Correspondence ID:		roject:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y	
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 Web Form	00:00:00						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate t alternative p provide grea This alternat me. * Put Natura	lans present ter pedestria ive plan wo l Resources	ed in the da in access. uld provide First. Prote	raft environmental e more opportunity ection of the natura	impact state for non-OR al resources	ment, I support V uses of the be and wildlife of t	the identifience in the identifience is the seashor in the seashor is the seashor	nage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the ied "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to re should come first, and recreational use should be
	migrating, ar are minimum * Establish a management degraded abi implemented as breeding of Thank you for	nd wintering ns and shoul nd Meet Cla targets in the lities. When until recover ones. or the oppor	g species. V ld be increa ear Goals f ne DEIS, th e birds, tur ery goals a tunity to pr	Vildlife protection ased if necessary to or Wildlife Recovery ney need more thou tles, and plants are re met. These goal	must be base o protect bree ery. A plan n rough vetting e not coming (s, and adeque eents. I will b	ed on the best so eding birds and nust include cle g based on the p back as planne ate managemer e following the	cientific inf sea turtles. ar goals and otential of d, based on at to realize progress o	ee of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, formation. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan d milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent a annual reviews, additional protective measures should be them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7100 P private May,07,2010 Web Form	roject:) 11:13:38	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y	
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate t alternative pl provide grea	lans present ter pedestria	ed in the di in access.	raft environmental	impact state	ment, I support	the identifi	nage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the ied "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	*Provide Eq 16 of the 68 least half of t approach wo chance to ref * Put Natura consistent wi migrating, ar are minimun * Establish a management degraded abi implemented as breeding of Thank you for	and Access f total miles of the beach sh uld provide oound to its 1 Resources ith this prote d wintering as and shoul and Meet Cle targets in th lities. Wher a until recover ones.	for All Vision Seashore ould be ave balanced a traditional First. Protection. The g species. V d be increase ar Goals fine DEIS, the e birds, tur ery goals a tunity to pro-	tors. Under the Na beach. This does ailable year round access for all visito numbers and dive ection of the natur. preferred plan fai Vildlife protection used if necessary to or Wildlife Recov- ney need more thou tles, and plants are re met. These goal	tional Park s not represen for non-OR' rs. Pedestria resity within t al resources : ls to set aside must be base p protect brea- ery. A plan n rough vetting e not coming s, and adequi-	Service's preferri t a fair balance V users and will ns and families he park. and wildlife of t e adequate areas ed on the best so eding birds and nust include cle g based on the p back as planne ate management the following the	red plan, Al for other us dlife. Coml could then the Seashor is that are fr cientific inf sea turtles. ar goals and otential of d, based on tt to realize progress o	ot choose to enact Alternative D: Iternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only sers and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at bined with more walkways and better access facilities, this more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a re should come first, and recreational use should be ee of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, formation. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan d milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent annual reviews, additional protective measures should be them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 Web Form		10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y	nage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
Correspondence:	alternative pl provide grea	lans present ter pedestria	ed in the di in access.	raft environmental	impact state	ment, I support	the identifi	result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	The followin *Provide Eq 16 of the 68 least half of t approach wo chance to ret * Put Natura consistent wi migrating, ar are minimum * Establish a	ual Access f total miles of the beach sh ould provide bound to its 1 Resources ith this proto and wintering as and shoul and Meet Clo	For All Vision All Vision Seashore nould be available av	tors. Under the Na e beach. This does ailable year round access for all visito numbers and dive ection of the nature preferred plan fai Vildlife protection ased if necessary to or Wildlife Recovery	tional Park 5 not represen for non-OR rs. Pedestria rsity within t al resources ls to set aside must be base p protect bree ery. A plan n	Service's preferri- t a fair balance V users and wil- ns and families he park. and wildlife of t e adequate areas ed on the best su- eding birds and nust include cle	red plan, Al for other us dlife. Comb could then the Seashor s that are fro- cientific inf sea turtles. ar goals and	d milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are
	degraded abi	lities. When I until recov	e birds, tur	tles, and plants are	e not coming	back as planne	d, based on	the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent a annual reviews, additional protective measures should be them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7102 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May 07 2010 11:13:38
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May.07,2010 11:13:38 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather th
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7103 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, J support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide grater pedestrina access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife could them more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be increased if necessary to protect breeding based on the best scientific information. Wildlife father than on its recent degraded abilities. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to wildlife retarcetor in its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on nanual reviews, additional protective measures sh
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7104 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y mixing May,07,2010 11:13:38 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. "The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and winterin

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

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

0010879

Correspondence ID:	7105 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be fo
Correspondence ID:	7106 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 11:13:52
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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: Name:	7107 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 11:13:52 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,
	migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	7108 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 11:13:52 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	7109 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 11:13:52 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ractovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7110 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:13:58 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV usey ear round for wildlife including breeding, migrating
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7111 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID:							
Name: Received:	7112 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:14:09						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to						
	 me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ractory. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the oppor						
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7113 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:14:09 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including bree						
	 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 						

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

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

* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 11:14:10
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as w as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 11:14:17 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rate than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A pla
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7117 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 11:14:17 Web Form In appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me.

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 11:14:17 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be interpreted in protection to protect beeding bried and east turtles.
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	7119 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 11:14:17 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t
	provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative 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 we as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7120 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:14:17 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 11:14:18 Web Ecom
Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7122 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:14:24 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free O ORV usey ear round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred pl
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7123 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access

provide 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.

Correspondence ID: Name:	7124 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 11:14:24
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan
	are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7125 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Shumen, John D May,07,2010 11:16:38 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7126 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Latham, Judith C May,07,2010 11:18:33 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7127 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I Image: Statement (DEIS). Image: Statement (DEIS). 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7128 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:40:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which
	 Intervention of the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and winte
Correspondence ID: Name:	7129 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 11:40:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7130 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 11:40:41 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the be

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7131 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May 07 2010 11:40:43					
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 11:40:43 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including bredering, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them,					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7132 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 11:40:44 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative plan would provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for no-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and win					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7133 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:40:45 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for no-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating,					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7134 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:40:45 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which					

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7135 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:40:45					
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 11:40:45 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistet with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include cle					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7136 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 11:40:45 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for no-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must in					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7137 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 11:40:51 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.					

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent

with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

Correspondence ID:	7138 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 11:40:51 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recover
Common and an as ID:	7120 Designate 10641 Descurrente 22506 Drivetor V
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7139 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:40:51 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which
	 was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and win
Correspondence ID: Name:	7140 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 11:40:52
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities

	0010890
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7141 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:40:52 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should core first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including bree
Correspondence ID: Name:	7142 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 11:40:53 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management t
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7143 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 11:40:53 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underprin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to prot
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7144 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:40:59 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7145 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:41:01 Web Form
Correspondence:	 I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather t
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7146 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 11:41:01 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could hem more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7147 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the 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 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

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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: Received:	private 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 consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be importent be asside adequate ma
Correspondence ID: Name:	7149 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 11:41:07
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.
Correspondence ID:	7150 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private 10041 Document: 52590 Filvate: 1
Received:	May,07,2010 11:41:08
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate manag
Correspondence ID: Name:	7151 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private

correspondence in.	/151	i i ojecu	10041	Document.	52570	1 1 1 1 1 1
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07	,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Fo	rm				

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

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

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

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

Received: Correspondence Type:	7152 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 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 HA BEEN RAN OVER. NATIVES 7 WILDLIFE WERE HERE FIRST. HUMANS, YOU NEED TO SHARE. AND ENFORECE THE BEACH LAWS THE LIFEGUARDS DO NOT. THEIR IS NO BEACH PATROL. PEOPLE TAKE THEIR PETS OUT IN HOT SAND, AND NO NED 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 PRO 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 THI ROOM TO MAKE IT TO THEIR HOME- THE SEA. PROTECT OUR PONIES/MUSTANGS. ENFORCE THE BEACH LAWS!!!, IT'S MOSTLJ NOT EVEN THE NATIVES BREAKING THE LAWS, SO POST MORE SIGNS FOR THE TOURIST!! I appreciate the opportunity to comment National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F. ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, th approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have chance to rebound to its
Correspondence ID:	7153 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received:	May,07,2010 11:41:13 Web Form
Correspondence Type:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

Y

Correspondence ID:	7154	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,20	010 11:41:14				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form	1				

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

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

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

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best 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 breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7155 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:41:14 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underprin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, a
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7156 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 11:41:15 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of MV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife necovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if n
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7157 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:41:15 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7158 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:41:21 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wil
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7159 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:41:22 Web Form 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 mildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan alis to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including bre
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7160 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:41:22 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protect

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	7161 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 11:41:22
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the post scientific information. Wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on
Correspondence ID:	7162 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 11:41:23 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goal
Correspondence ID:	7163 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 11:41:29
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative D an would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recluding breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as
Correspondence ID: Name:	7164 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private

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.

Correspondence ID:	7165 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y					
Name: Received:	private 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 consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recov					
Correspondence ID:	7166 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y					
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,2010 11:41:38					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form Langragists the expertunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage OPV use on Cape Hatteres National Seeshere. Of the					
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which					
	was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the					
	beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.					
	The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:					
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only					
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at					
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this					
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a					
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this					
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating,					
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are					
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.					
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are					
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be					
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as would be for migrating and wintering spec					
	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be					
Correspondence ID:	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as would be for migrating and wintering spec					
Name:	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.					
Name: Received:	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be increased and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.					
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.					
Name: Received:	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be increased and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.					
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. 7167 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:41:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the					
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisted with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the post: a should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. 7167 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:41:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of					
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.					
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wittering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife ractovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife ractover measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. 7167 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:41:41 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedest					
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.					
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.					

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y te 07,2010 11:41:42 Form reciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras Nationa ative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater per dentified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for es and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. ollowing principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: de Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibite the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allow half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better ach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. atural Resources First: Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the promus and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. lish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Wh gement targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rathe ded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as pla	destrian access, which non-ORV uses of the d year round on only ed within the park, at access facilities, this wildlife could have a se should be consistent breeding, migrating, eferred plan are ere there are or than on its recent measures should be
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y te 07,2010 11:41:48 Form reciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras Nationa ative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater per dentified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for leas and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. ollowing principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: de Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibite the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allow half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better ach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and the to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. latural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational us his protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including vintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife if ercovery. Whigement targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of th	destrian access, which non-ORV uses of the d year round on only ed within the park, at access facilities, this wildlife could have a se should be consistent breeding, migrating, eferred plan are ere there are r than on its recent measures should be
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y te 07,2010 11:41:52 Form reciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras Nationa ative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater per dentified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for use and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. ollowing principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: de Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibite the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allow half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better ach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and re to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. atural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational us his protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including intering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the promums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. lish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlif	destrian access, which non-ORV uses of the d year round on only ed within the park, at access facilities, this wildlife could have a se should be consistent breeding, migrating, eferred plan are ere there are or than on its recent measures should be

Common and an as IDs	7171 Busingt 10641 Degement 22506 Bringto V
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7171 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:41:53
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife racted may migrating and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where bir
Correspondence ID:	7172 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 11:41:53
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breafering, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where
Correspondence ID: Name:	7173 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 11:43:36 Web Form
Correspondence:	 I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on onl 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, sapproach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protect
Correspondence ID: Name:	7174 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May 07 2010 11:42:36
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 11:43:36 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7175 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide 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 generation 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: Name: Received:	7176 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:43:57
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews,
Correspondence ID: Name:	Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y Divide Divide Y Y Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 00:000 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified 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: Name:	7178 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y

Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 11:43:58 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews,
Correspondence ID:	7179 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 11:43:58
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where bi
Correspondence ID:	7180 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative 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 mildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should core first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate ma

	0010902
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7181 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:44:08
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7182 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:44:09 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the n
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7183 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:44:09 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resource

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

0010902

	0010903
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7184 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to 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 of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7185 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:44:09 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and mildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including
Correspondence ID:	7186 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 11:44:09 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recov

as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 11:44:18
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 11:44:18 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7189 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:44:18 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be
	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7190 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 11:44:18 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
	* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	Project: 10641 Document: 32596 van Dorsten, Peter H May,07,2010 00:00:00 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7192 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Johnston, Lynn May,07,2010 11:58:59 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7193 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:01:39 Web Form Veb Form Vestor
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7194 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:10:42 Web Form Y
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

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

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

Correspondence ID:	
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7195 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:10:43 Web Form Vector Vect
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife rotection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based o
Correspondence ID: Name:	7196 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:10:43 Web Form 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, ord windring compacity. Wildlife directore mout the baced on the bact escintion in the park to menter.
	and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 12:10:48
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protectiv
Correspondence ID:	7199 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	May.07,2010 12:10:48
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7200 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the 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 Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and pl
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Y Y

	0010908
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative 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
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7202 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 12:10:53 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore buffer in the preferred plan are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferre
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7203 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 12:10:59 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore bould for wildlife protecting, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are final plans. But Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consis
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7204 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:10:59 Web Form I I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

Correspondence ID:	7205 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 12:11:04 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 12:11:04 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
-	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7207 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Garcia, Armando A May,07,2010 12:11:07 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
	2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received:	7208 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:11:08
Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID:	7209 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 12:11:10 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore bould for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7210 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private 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 consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goal
Correspondence ID:	7211 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	7211 Froject: 10041 Document: 32390 Frivate: 1 private May,07,2010 12:11:10

	0010911
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7212 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 12:11:10 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore buffers in the preferred plan arialis to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific informat
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7213 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7214 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:11:16 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principale schould undergine the next of the optical plan, should it not choose to anost Alternative D:

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

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

Nomo	7215 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 12:11:16
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	
Correspondence ID: Name:	7216 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 12:11:16 Web Form
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, whic was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should for wildlife including breeding, migrating and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are marked and wintering species.
	minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as w 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!

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

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 12:11:16
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be variable year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consister with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional
Correspondence ID:	7219 Project: 10641 Document: 32596
Name: Received:	Dickinson, Robert May,07,2010 12:11:18
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray,
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 draplan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of
	the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the bes examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Correspondence ID: Name:	7220 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received:	May,07,2010 12:11:22
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for
Correspondence ID: Name:	7221 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y

Name:

private

Received:

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7222 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:11:22 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underprin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for on-ORV users and avildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore bould come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, an
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7223 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:11:24 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmentally preferred alternative. I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, mi
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7224 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:11:24 Web Form I I In the draft environment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the quest environment of the neuron of the neuron of the neuron of the park of the there are an environment of the neuron of t

16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

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

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

Correspondence ID:	7225 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name:	private
Received:	May,07,2010 12:11:24
Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals
Correspondence ID: Name:	7226 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 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 support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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 May 07 2010 12:11:30
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:11:30 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7228 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:11:30
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additio
Correspondence ID:	7229 Project: 10641 Document: 32596
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 mankowski, craig s May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations, and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wi
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7230 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential th

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7231 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:12:12 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wildlemess, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildemess," 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational use
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7232 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Marcus, Christina May,07,2010 12:12:12 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS pr
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7233 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Knight, James A May,07,2010 12:12:18 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7234 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 spakowski, jeff May,07,2010 00:00:00 Image: Constraint of the second se

Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	
	 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wildeness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the h
Correspondence ID:	7235 Project: 10641 Document: 32596
Name:	Greenwood, James G
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 12:12:21 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: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 00:00:00 : Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf
	 plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of
	the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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•	Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name:	Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. ************************************
	Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. ************************************

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7238 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Silvey, Kevin May,07,2010 12:12:34 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations" 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildleress" 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park sys
	Mr. Kevin Silvey 9263 78th Place North Seminole, Florida 33777-4013
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:12:39 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally prefered" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Planz/EIS must assert NPS autho
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7240 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Fredsti, Dana May,07,2010 12:12:41 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7241 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:12:52 Web Form DON'T LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7242 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Gaebe, Gail May,07,2010 12:12:52 Web Form Please protect the few natural areas still in existence from motorized traffic. There are a number of lovely areas aleady open for motorized traffic.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7243 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Reynolds, Jonelle May,07,2010 12:13:00 Web Form

Please preserve this and honor it free of invasion and violation with off road vehicles thank you

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7244 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Klausing, Michael L May,07,2010 12:13:05 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray,
	As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must a
Correspondence ID:	7245 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 12:13:06 Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7246 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Deal, Jeffrey G
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	turtles and shorebirds. 7247 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Macdonald, Lisa May,07,2010 12:13:33
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name:	7248 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 12:13:34 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatter
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7249 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Kramer, Kelly A May,07,2010 12:14:03 Web Form 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" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authorit
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7250 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Schmitt, David J May,07,2010 12:14:07 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produce

ce: 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:	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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7252 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:000 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wildermess, and ORV use. It is absolutely esse
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7253 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Hopkins, Amy May,07,2010 12:14:13 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established. Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildlerness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor exp
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7254 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must 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: Received:	private 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: Received:	N/A, N/A 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: Received:	Tatum, Beth 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 E
	if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
	1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all
	visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of
	future generations."
	2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of
	the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness"
	Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
	3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and
	analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Correspondence:	Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray,
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.
Comognendance ID:	
Correspondence ID: Name:	7259 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 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.

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

me.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7260 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:14:16 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7261 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:14:17 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. "Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife interher than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles,
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7262 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7263 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:14:17 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7264 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:14:17 Web Form We need to keep Cape Hatteras beaches free of vehicles!							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7265 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:14:18 Web Form							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be							
	consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred pla are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 7266 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:14:18 Y Y							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important t							
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are 							
	management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7267 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:14:18							

Correspondence Type: V Correspondence: I

Ype: Web Form 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 12:14:18								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to								
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.								
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rater than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well								
	as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.								
	· ·								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7269 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:14:18 Web Form I Appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the								
-	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 det 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: Name: Received:	7270 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:14:25								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 Superindendent 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7271 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Keiser, John L May,07,2010 12:14:33 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational use, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 								

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	McGoldrick, Bill May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form						
	Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the dra plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentall preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife reso						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7273 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:14:46 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: Name: Received:	7274 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drar plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wildemess, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by mo						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7275 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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."

When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received:	7276 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:14:48 Web Form									
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.									
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources									
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7277 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:14:50 Web Form 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 specialabundant (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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7278 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:14:51 Web Form PLEASE DISALLOW OFF ROAD VEHICLES ON CAPE HATTARAS. RIDICULOUS THOUGHT TO BEGIN WITH. Let's protect nature.									
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Y									
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective mea									

We have known that ORV'S are distructive 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: Name: Received:	7280 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 V									
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified t provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.									
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7281 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:14:52 Web Form									
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as br									
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7282 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Wadsworth, Don and Gwenn L May,07,2010 12:15:09 Web Form Web Form We have witness the destruction that off road vehicles have caused across our country, please no more!!!!! Thanks!									
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7283 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Lyda, Mary May,07,2010 12:15:10 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7284 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:15:10 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.									

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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
Rame: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Private May,07,2010 12:15:11 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 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 doing 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 e
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7286 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:15:11 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plans would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational us should be received planed accessity to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate man
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7287 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:15:12 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including bre

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Hoisington May,07,20 Web Form	Project: , Chuck 10 12:15:12 s on Cape Ha	10641 tteras beach	Document:	32596			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,20 Web Form I appreciate						Y plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if more	
	This alterna me. The follow *Provide E 16 of the 60 least half o approach w chance to r * Put Natur consistent v migrating, are minimu * Establish managemen degraded al implementa as breeding	ing principles qual Access f 8 total miles of f the beach sh rould provide ebound to its ral Resources with this proto and wintering mus and shoul and Meet Cle nt targets in t bilities. When ed until recov g ones.	ald provide should und for All Visite of Seashore 1 ould be ava balanced ac traditional n First. Protect ection. The p species. W d be increase ear Goals fo ne DEIS, that e birds, turtlery goals are	erpin the park's fo ors. Under the Na beach. This does i ilable year round cess for all visito umbers and diver tion of the natura oreferred plan fail ildlife protection ed if necessary to r Wildlife Recover ey need more thor es, and plants are e met. These goal	prmulation o tional Park S not represent for non-ORV rs. Pedestriau sity within ti al resources a s to set aside must be base p protect bree ry. A plan m ough vetting not coming s, and adequ	f its final plan, i ervice's preferr a fair balance i / users and will as and families ne park. Ind wildlife of the adequate areas d on the best sc ding birds and ust include cle based on the back as planne- ate managemer	eaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are imposed plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round of for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the p dlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilitie could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could be sthat are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including bree cientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferr sea turtles. ar goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are otential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its red d, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be for migrating and wintering species progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a	on only ark, at s, this have a eding, red plan cent uld be s as well
		-		at better protects				
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,20 Web Form I appreciate This alternative provide gre This alterna- me. The follow *Provide E 16 of the 60 least half o approach w chance to r * Put Natun consistent v migrating, are minimu * Establish managemen degraded ai implementu as breeding Thank you	plans present atter pedestria attive plan wor ing principles qual Access f 8 total miles of f the beach sh yould provide ebound to its ral Resources with this prote and wintering ums and shoul and Meet Cle nt targets in th biblities. Wher ed until recov gones. for the oppor	ed in the dra n access. ald provide should und or All Visiti of Seashore I ould be ava balanced ac traditional n First. Protea crtion. The p species. W d be increase ar Goals fo the birds, turtl ery goals are tunity to pro-	ft environmental more opportunity erpin the park's fc ors. Under the Na beach. This does ilable year round cess for all visito umbers and diver- tion of the nature oreferred plan fail ildlife protection ed if necessary to r Wildlife Recove y need more thor es, and plants are e met. These goal	impact state for non-OR primulation of tional Park S not represent for non-OR rs. Pedestriau rsity within th di resources a protect bree protect bree protect bree ry. A plan n ough vetting on coming s, and adequ ents. I will b	nent, I support V uses of the be fits final plan, i iervice's preferr a fair balance v users and wild as and families ne park. and wildlife of t adequate areas d on the best so ding birds and ust include cle based on the p back as planne ate management e following the	ar goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are otential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its red d, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures shou t to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a	dified to ortant to on only ark, at s, this have a eding, red plan cent uld be s as wel
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,20 Web Form I appreciate alternative provide gree This alterna me. The follow	plans present eater pedestria ative plan wor	ed in the dra in access. uld provide should und	ft environmental more opportunity erpin the park's fo	impact states for non-OR prmulation o	ment, I support V uses of the be f its final plan,	Y plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if more eaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are impo- should it not choose to enact Alternative D: red plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round of	dified to

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7292 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Lurie-Janicki, Ellaine May,07,2010 12:15:16 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can
	3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7293 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:15:16 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore: The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for r
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7294 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 step 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 beache, 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

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 oflife 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: Name: Received:	7295 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Oswald, Sarah May,07,2010 12:15:34
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7296 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:15:34
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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 opporunity to enjoy quiet, beautiful Cape Hatteras. Thank you for your consideration.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7297 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:15:34
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to
	 me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife racher than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7298 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Wingate, Julie May,07,2010 12:15:34 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks. I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with

its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7299 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:15:34 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7300Project:10641Document:32596DeBruton, Noel CMay,07,2010 12:15:35Heave well enough alone!Leave well enough alone!
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7301 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:15:35 Web Form 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 wildemess, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7302 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07.2010 12:15:35 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery.

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

Correspondence ID: Name:	7303 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y								
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative 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 we as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 12:15:36								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate area that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife retorery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on ann								
Correspondence ID:	7305 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y								
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to reprivate constant optimizer optimizers.								
	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 adjacen 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 beac 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 t								
	me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be								

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7306 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:15:36 Web Form								
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.								
	This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.								
	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7307 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private: May,07,2010 12:15:36 Web Form I approciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goal								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7308 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Zawaski, Joan May,07,2010 12:16:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wildemess, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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:	7315 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7314 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 malone, judith a May,07,2010 12:16:24 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7313 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Mackewich, Susan May,07,2010 12:16:20 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7312 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:16:20 Web Form As a frequent visitor to the Outter Banks I find it hard to fathom that anyone would allow off road vehicles or regular automobiles onto the pristine area 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7311 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 specialabundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore. Carol Czajkowski
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7310 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:16:01 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which i depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essen
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7309 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Saito, Don M May,07,2010 12:16:01 Web Form 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.

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."

 When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7316 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:16:29 Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drar plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7317 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:16:29 Y Y Web Form Please protect our land from the noise and pollutants that stem from on- and off-road vehicles. Thank you. Y
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7318 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Barella, Frank M May,07,2010 12:16:30 Web Form Folkshave 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7319 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Esposito, Dan J May,07,2010 12:16:31 Web Form Please adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting that which makes Cape Hatteras so specialabundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore. Thank you. Thank you.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7320 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:16:31 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drar plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with

its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

M. Ziolkowski

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7321 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:16:31 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7322 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 dawson, dan May,07,2010 12:16:37 Web Form Please keep our peaceful places from becoming littered with noise and pollution
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7323 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Matusek, Lynda May,07,2010 12:16:42 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7324 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:16:48 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7325 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 12:16:56 Web Form As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experie
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7326 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:16:56 Web Form

Correspondence:	 Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur withou
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7327 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Save the beaches!!! Image: Control of the second s
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7328 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:17:00 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7329 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:17:00 Web Form Adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting that which makes Cape Hatteras so specialabundant (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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7330 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Craig, Ella M May,07,2010 12:17:08 Web Form Please don't allow off-road vehicles on the beach. People will be killed or injured, and wildlife will suffer.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7331 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Johnson, David G
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7332 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Webb, Kimberly May,07,2010 12:17:40 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7333 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Prentice, Sister Letitia May,07,2010 12:17:41 Web Form Beaches are not for vehicles-but people Beaches are not for vehicles-but people
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7334 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Margeson, Don W May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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."

When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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.

	Sincerely,
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7335 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Lewis, Suzanne May,07,2010 12:17:43 Web Form When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7336 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Terhune, Greg May.07,2010 12:17:43 Web Form As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essentid that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7337 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Peck, Naomi May,07,2010 12:17:44 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The Kather Action and Planchist and Planchist statement wild resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to

	0010942
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7338 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:17:44 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adatable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 2) When Cape Hatteras was ostablished, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7339 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Backman, Karen Hedwig
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7340 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Steckervetz, Lori L May,07,2010 12:17:45 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7341 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Ruiz, O. E May,07,2010 12:17:45 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wildlerness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D. if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wildlerness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7342 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:17:45 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7343 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:17:45 Web Form Please do not allow the fragile wetlands of Cape Hatteras to be damaged by allowing off-road vehicles to use them. Please do not allow the fragile wetlands of Cape Hatteras to be damaged by allowing off-road vehicles to use them.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7344 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:17:46 Web Form Natural areas are for peace and quiet! No off road vehicles, please!
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7345 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Mantas, Nicholas A May,07,2010 12:17:47 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolian. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS pro
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7346 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:17:47 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7347 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 12:17:48 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Ca

an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID:	7348 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y	
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 12:17:50	
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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: Name: Received:	7349 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:17:57 32596	
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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: Name: Received:	7350 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:17:57	
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7351 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Potucek, Kimberly A May,07,2010 12:18:01 Web Form 32596	
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7352 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Putnam, Andrew May 07 2010 12:18:02	
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 12:18:02 Web Form 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 an 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	
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 12:18:04 Web Form 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 usednot subjective emotional science by prejudiced environmentalists	
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:18:04 Web Form 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 usednot subjective emotional	

Correspondence:	get them away
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7355 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 krick, jessica May,07,2010 12:18:06 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for c
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7356 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:18:08 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray,
	As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must ass
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7357 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Gay, Larry May,07,2010 12:18:10 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D
	 if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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

	0010946
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 12:18:23 Web Form 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 permanenty reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wil
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7359 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Snyder, William H May,07,2010 12:18:24 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely esse
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7360 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Dickey, Charles May,07,2010 12:18:25 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7361 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Niesman, Diane L May.07,2010 12:18:28 Web Form 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,
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7362 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Cote, Honorie May,07,2010 12:18:29 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife must take

y isitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting registration to protect and precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of

the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Correspondence:	Web Form 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
correspondence.	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: Correspondence:	Web Form 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: Correspondence:	Web Form Deer Superintendent Murray
correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the dra
	plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with
	its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird
	watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement
	privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that
	make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
	1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all
	visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take
	precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of
	future generations."
	2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness"
	Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the
	pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
	3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and
	analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the bes 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 th 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. Lapprovide the change to submit comments on the deal
	As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the dra plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with
	its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird
	watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement
	privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that
	make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative
	if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all
	visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take
	precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of
	precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
	future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of
	future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness"
	future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the
	future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
	future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and
	future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
	future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must 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:	future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the bes examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

 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."

 When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7368 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:18:37 Web Form Please NO to ORV on these beaches
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7369 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:18:40 Web Form No off road vehicles. Vehicles. Vehicles.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7370 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Smedira, Carrie F May,07,2010 12:18:43 Web Form 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 Brooklyn 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7371 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:18:46 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," 7) Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7372 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:18:46 Web Form 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

7373 Project: 10641 32596 **Correspondence ID:** Document: Name: Schollenberger, Craig R May,07,2010 12:18:57 **Received: 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. 7374 **Project:** 10641 32596 **Correspondence ID:** Document: Fiorentino, Doris Name: **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 Paul, Mark D Name: May,07,2010 00:00:00 **Received: Correspondence Type:** Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, 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, Mark D. Paul 7376 Y **Correspondence ID: Project:** 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Name: private May,07,2010 12:19:05 **Received: Correspondence Type:** Web Form Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

0010949

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Received:	private 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 meit is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the
	storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is
	unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of
	future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received:	7378 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 mcnamara, kevin m May,07,2010 12:19:12 4
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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: Name: Received:	7379 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:19:13
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take preceduce over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7380 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:19:14 Web Form 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

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7381 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:19:14 Web Form Dear Superinitendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the baches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 2) When Cape Hatteras was osts to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absol
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7382 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Mandell-Rice, Bonnie S May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 uses is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7383 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Larson, Pat May,07,2010 12:19:23 Web Form Please keep Off Road Vehicles off the Cape Hatteras Beaches. Save the beaches for peaceful walking and wildlife.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7384Project:10641Document:32596Private:YprivateMay,07,201012:19:26Web FormNo vehicles on the beach except safety vehilces. Our beaches are not dumps.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7385Project:10641Document:32596laurie, annieMay,07,2010 12:19:26Web FormDear 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 must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7386 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Garrett, Sandra May,07,2010 12:19:29 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7387 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:19:30 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS prot
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7388 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate 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 DONT 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 recreational (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially ad

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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7389 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Phillips, Richard J May,07,2010 12:19:34 Web Form Vent Vent
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally prefered" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
C	7200 Destate 10641 Deserved 22506
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7390 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Morocco, Carol May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to maage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3
Correspondence ID: Name:	7391 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:19:36 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilde

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Received:	private 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 t entertain a few with ATV privileges.
Correspondence ID:	7393 Project: 10641 Document: 32596
Name: Received:	Wagner, Vickie M 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 dra 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 I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
	1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 intent Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name:	7394 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7395 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Aegerter, Bob May,07,2010 12:19:43 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 12:19:44
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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 th expense of hikers and others trying to enjoy nature as it was intended.
Correspondence ID:	7397 Project: 10641 Document: 32596
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Kleindenst, Fred c May,07,2010 12:19:46 Web Form Off road use by any motor vehicles is always destructive and needs to be prohibited.
correspondence.	on road use by any motor venicies is always destructive and needs to be promotical.

	0010955
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative 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'! 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations," 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The fina Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7399 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 kelley, jane E May,07,2010 12:19:50 Web Form 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 seashorenot now and not ever. Jane E. Kelley 66 Longmeadow Drive Amherst, MA 01002-3326
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7400 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:19:51 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7401 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:19:53 Web Form Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7402 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 12:19:54 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thure generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS pr

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7403 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 butenschoen, van w May,07,2010 12:19:55 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7404 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:20:00 Web Form 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 wildemess" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank yo
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7405 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:20:03 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draff plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations. and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area ashall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildemess" 3) The final PlanzEIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produ
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7406 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 McGill, Ann C May,07,2010 12:20:05 Web Form 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 inhabitents.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7407 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:20:05 Y Web Form 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: Name:	7408 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private

	0010957
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 12:20:16 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and mary other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatter
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7409 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Dobbs, Michael May,07,2010 12:20:17 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thure generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, in response to information produced by monitoring and a
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7410 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Senour, Jon May,07,2010 12:20:24 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS 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:
 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.

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."

 When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7412 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Powers, Janet M May,07,2010 12:20:31 Web Form 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 Hastteras 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7413 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:20:36 Web Form As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reser
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7414 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:20:36 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produ
Correspondence ID: Name:	7415 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private

. May,07,2010 12:20:37

Web Form

Received:

Correspondence Type:

Correspondence:

0010959

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: Received: Correspondence Type:	Kellogg, Caroline May,07,2010 12:20:39 Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3)
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7417 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:20:41
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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: Name: Received:	7418 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:20:41
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form The Cape Hatteras area should be kept as pristine as possible. Commercialiaztion will endanger all wildlife there.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7419 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 12:20:47 Web Form 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." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NP
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7420 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, I 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 t 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 draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement

privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7421 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:20:50 Web Form Please prohibit ORV use at Cape Hatteras.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7422 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, Iam 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 dr plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource wit its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions o the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent o						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7423 robey, va May,07,2 Web Forr DON'T!!!	010 12:20:55 n	10641	Document:	32596		
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7424 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:20:57 Web Form 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 o natural world.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7425 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Peterson, Susan May,07,2010 12:21:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resou its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationer watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statemen privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtle make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alter if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.						

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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.

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 favoratism 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: Name:	7426 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Long Crow, Kelly D
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 12:21:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative E if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, and other weight for species recovery goals. a) The final Plan/ElS must assert NPS authority to
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7427 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Schunck, Tobias P May,07,2010 12:21:00 Web Form Please reduce and limit ORV usage. ORVs are highly destructive to the environment. They will destroy the fragile dunes and increase erosion. Everyon 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7428 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:21:04 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7429 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Saulter, A May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in 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 turtlet 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 ara, deemed to be especially

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Received:	private May 07 2010 12:21:10			
Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 12:21:10 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: Correspondence:	Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray,			
	As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrin visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must as			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	Sincerely, Jayme S. P. Miller 7432 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 LEALI, ROBERT P May,07,2010 12:21:16 May 32596			
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form SAVE ALL THAT WE CAN - WE ALREADY LOOSE TO OUR OUR CURRENT AND PAST ECOLOGICAL MISTAKES.			
Correspondence ID: Name:	7433 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 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 glutted with all kinds of vehicles. The area is too beautiful to clutter it. More natural ways of visiting there seem more appropriate.			
Common and an as ID.	7424 Designet: 10641 Deserverset: 22506 Designets: V			
Correspondence ID: Name:	7434 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private			
Received:	May,07,2010 12:21:20			
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 ass			
	analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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 Darling, PhD			

Correspondence ID:	7440 Project: 10641 Document: 32596
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7439 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Stitt, Bryan J May,07,2010 12:21:34 Web Form 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 iswe can't be adding to the destruction. We don't need another Daytona Beach, Fl.!!!
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7438 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:21:31 Web Form Iurge 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	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 avesome 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 7437 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Link, John J May,07,2010 12:21:23 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resou
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Birds and other beach creatures don't burn petrochemicals. I prefer limiting the polluting ORV range of destruction. 7436 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May.07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D. if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpared for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system uni
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7435 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Kennedy, Arthur May,07,2010 12:21:22 Web Form Birds and other beach creatures don't burn petrochemicals. I prefer limiting the polluting ORV range of destruction.

Webb, Terry L 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. turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Name:

Received:

Torry	and	Clayton	Wabb
Terry	anu	Clayton	W COU

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7441 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Cheeseman, Ted May,07,2010 12:21:37 Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7442 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private: May,07,2010 12:21:40 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting is wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7443 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Cypherd, Victoria A May,07,2010 12:21:48 32596

Correspondence Type: Correspondence: Web Form 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: Name:	7444 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:21:51 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird
	watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of
	precedence over one form of recreation (OKVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpared for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7445 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:21:52 Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with tits sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally prefered" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and ded
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7446 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to mange Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achiev

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7447Project:10641Document:32596Peloquen MD, James LMay,07,2010May,07,201012:21:55Web FormProtect Cape Hatteras National Park from ORV!!!!
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7448 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Lapointe, Eric May,07,2010 12:21:56 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following point weilderness" 2) When Cape Hatteras was established for recreational uses, the said area a shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analy
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7449 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate 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" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlifie species recovery goals. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildliffe species rec
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7450 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Raper, Connie K May,07,2010 12:22:03 Web Form As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achie

	0010967	
Name: Deal, John R Received: May,07,2010 12:22:05 Correspondence Type: Web Form Dorrespondence: Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comm plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the baches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant is sandy bacches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vac: watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact sta privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, an make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife mu precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness. Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NT pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resource 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildl		
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7452 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Fay, Robert H May,07,2010 12:22:10 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, bird, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational use, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not QRV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow QRV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS author	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7453Project:10641Document:32596Private:YprivateMay,07,2010 12:22:11Web FormPlease keep off road vehicles off on Cape Hatteras	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7454 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Modisette, Holly A May,07,2010 12:22:15 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS pro	

	0010908
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Bell, Denise C May,07,2010 12:22:16 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildlemess" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7456 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:22:18 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentall preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on Wich it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "minipaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 7 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely es
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7457 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Miles, Margaret s May,07,2010 12:22:19 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7458 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Elliott, Lynn M May,07,2010 12:22:21 Web Form As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wildemess, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the siad area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 2) When Cape Hatteras was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received:	7459 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Schmitz, Mary Jude F May,07,2010 00:00:00 100:00:00
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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
	examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7460 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Pehme, Kalev May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thura generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the ara, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area ashall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7461 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Koloze, Kathy May,07,2010 12:22:36 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7462 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Swem, Virginia L May,07,2010 12:22:38 Web Form 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 Assitant 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7463 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:22:44 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7464 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and mary other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentali mpact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentali preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congres
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7465 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Jones-Umberger, Stanley May,07,2010 12:22:47 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7466 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:22:48 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wildemess, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain protions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produc
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7467 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Banik, Lisa May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

	 The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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! ************************************
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7468 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Rogers, Connie May,07,2010 12:22:51
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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: Name: Received:	7469 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:22:52
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form Please keep off the road vehicles off the our national seashore. They are disruptive and destructive.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7470 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, Laura May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. 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 on information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. That sub stassert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. That final Plan/E
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7471 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:22:55 Web Form Please do not let off-road vehicles dominate the Hatteras shore. Image: Contract of the shore
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7472 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:22:56 Veb Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7473 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Franchi, Irena May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7474 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:22:59 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray,
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 drap plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must ass
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7475 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 crampton, vicky May,07,2010 12:23:04 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7476 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:23:10 Web Form I 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. The damage to the ecosystem is also a major factor.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7477 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Klucsor, Carmen A May,07,2010 12:23:16 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7478 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Gobely, Michelle May,07,2010 12:23:25 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drar plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7479 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Stehlin, Saundra R May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the dra plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative planes outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I 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 machinesCape 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" 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the sid area shall be permanentl
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7480Project:10641Document:32596Robinson, PaulMay,07,201012:23:29Web FormKeep those beautiful beaches safe and clean!
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7481 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 riger, richard May,07,2010 12:23:31 Web Form 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 errosion problems that are already going on around the country ? Think again boys and girls.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7482 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Desmond, Angela M May,07,2010 12:23:35 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the dra plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally prefered" Alternative 1 if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that

examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: Name:	7483 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May.07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drat plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. 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 bir 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 I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wildlerness, not ORV use. It
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7484 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:23:42 Web Form 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 bird Increased off-road vehicles will unfortunately destroy habitat and result in decreased wildlife population. I also have a personal concern with the dunes are so fragile that it would take very little to destroy the dunes and therefore the island itself. 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.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7485 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:23:46 Web Form 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.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7486 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:23:48 Web Form 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 o 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.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7487Project:10641Document:32596Private:YprivateMay,07,2010 12:23:51Web FormPlease carefaully consider the harmful effects that such vehicles can have on these precious dunes.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7488 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drap plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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.

Correspondence ID: Name:	7489 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:23:55 Web Form 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 comment on the draft plan to manage Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the 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 harmin
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7490 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Tomashevsky, Robert May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visiors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses. if eagured by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portion
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7491 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Gault, Carol A May,07,2010 12:24:05 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations "

future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must 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 Hatterras
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7492 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Wilke, Cathy L May,07,2010 12:24:13 Web Form Keep the "wild" places wild - from all motorized vehicles.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7493 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Warner, Christopher M May,07,2010 12:24:14 Web Form 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 you consideration, Chris Warner
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7494 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Mason, Lynelle May,07,2010 12:24:15 Web Form As a writer who is very interested in lighthouses, I urge you take whatever actin is necessary to protect Cape Hatteras. Sincerely, Lynelle Mason
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7495 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:24:17 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7496 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Walker, Carol 1 May,07,2010 12:24:20 Web Form 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 i 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 Loisians shore line even if the capping off that's being worked on does work becasuse 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7497 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Brangan, Sarah May,07,2010 12:24:21 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS prote

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received:	7498 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Loeb, Rema May,07,2010 12:24:23 Web Form
Correspondence Type: 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7499 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Weyand, Mike May,07,2010 12:24:24 Web Form Ban all off-road vehicles on the beach/dunes as they destroy the environment. Thank you!
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7500 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray,
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.
	 The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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
	 a) The read deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received:	7501 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:24:26
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of
	 precedence over one form of recreation (OKVs), and any recreational use is required by faw to feave the resource "uninparted for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received:	7502 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private 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

er of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness... Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7503 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Watson, Jim May,07,2010 12:24:42 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7504 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 12:2:4:42 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource winimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following points and rist or vaperiane to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 2) When Ca
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7505 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Kokoris, Moki May,07,2010 12:24:44 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thure generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, and wildlife resources. 3) The final Pl

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private: May,07,2010 12:24:45 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, all marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtes that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally prefered" Alternative Drivitiors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras (At and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Planz/ES must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thatk you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7507 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:24:47 Web Form 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!!!
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7508 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 00:00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft norinomental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified 'environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft furghore the value of the visitor and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations. " 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitor experience to come form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hattt
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7509 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Weeks, Mandy A May,07,2010 12:24:56 Web Form Please no vehicles or off-road vehicles at the Cape!
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7510 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:25:01 Web Form

Correspondence Type:Web FormCorrespondence:As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness... Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7511 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 DiPasquale, Denise M May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence Type: 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 perserve 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
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7512 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:25:11 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft or vironmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative E if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The Khan Eleis must 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) The final Plan/Els must assert NPS authori
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7513 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Caldwell, James May,07,2010 12:25:13 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, Dear Superintendent Murray, Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Paggived:	7514 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Doner, John P May 07 2010 12:25:20
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 12:25:20 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hattera
Correspondence ID: Name:	examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. 7515 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Frohn, Joyce
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:25:29 Web Form We need places in our world that are quiet, clean and peaceful. That does not combine with racing motor vehicles.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7516 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monit
Correspondence ID: Name:	7517 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private

Received:

Correspondence Type:

May,07,2010 12:25:35

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

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7518 Pro private May,07,2010 12 Web Form I would prefer I be okay.	2:25:35		32596 I. However, I	Private:	Y at the exemption applied to bicycles. Human powered "vehic	eles" should
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7519 Pro private May,07,2010 12 Web Form Please keep our	2:25:36	11 Document:	32596 hank you.	Private:	Y	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7520 Pro private May,07,2010 12 Web Form Allowing off-re	2:25:47		32596 ach such as th	Private: at of Cape Hatt	Y teras is, in every way, a very bad idea. Thanks!	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: 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! 7521 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:25:52 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visiors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the sid area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of p						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7522 Pro Williams, Char May,07,2010 12 Web Form We should not a	lie 2:26:04	Document:	32596 treasurer.			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	disproportionate	2:26:09 ark Service (NF ely dedicate be:	PS) NOT TO approve ach use to year-round	ORV traffic a	at the expense of	Y /) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore that of wildlife and pedestrian visitors. erse wildlife for future generations to enjoy. For my daughte	

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 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:								
Correspondence:	The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is no place for off road vehicles!	Dear Superintendent Murray, The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is no place for off road vehicles!						
	As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance	to submit comments on the dra						
	plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nat							
	its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherish							
	watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environ	mental impact statement						
	privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that							
	make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environr	nentally preferred" Alternative I						
	if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.							
	1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's author	0 0 1						
	visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protectir precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unin							
	future generations."	ipaned for the enjoyment of						
	2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason	. "Except for certain portions of						
	the area, demed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a print							
	Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely							
	pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and							
	3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information	n produced by monitoring and						
	analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Pa	1 0						
	examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final C	ORV management plan.						
Correspondence ID:	7525 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name:	private							
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00							
Correspondence Type:								
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray,	llauria a ma ta anharit a ana mata						
	I am a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, and I thank you for a on the draft plan to manage Off Read Vahiele (OPV) use on the basebas of Care Hattare National Sections. The Section 2019							
	on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seas resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This							
	vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in							
	statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and prote							
	turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identifie							
	Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.							
	1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all							
	visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protectir							
	precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unin	npaired for the enjoyment of						
	future generations." cur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.							
	2) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information	n produced by monitoring and						
	analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.	·····						
	Thank you for considering these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in p America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV manage							
	********************************** 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,							
	7527 D. 10741 D. 4 22507 D. 4 M							
	7526 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name:	private							
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 12:26:26							
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 12:26:26 e: Web Form	oth human and animal. In						
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 12:26:26							
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 12:26:26 e: Web Form I believe that allowing more off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras will enefit a few and endanger a great many more, be							
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 private May,07,2010 12:26:26 e: Web Form I believe that allowing more off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras will enefit a few and endanger a great many more, be addition to noise there is the danger to animals, land, sea, and air from being run over. Turtle and bird nests could well Off road vehicle use needs to be curtailed as much as possible to benefit the majority, both today and in the future. 							
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence: Correspondence ID:	private May,07,2010 12:26:26 Web Form I believe that allowing more off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras will enefit a few and endanger a great many more, be addition to noise there is the danger to animals, land, sea, and air from being run over. Turtle and bird nests could well Off road vehicle use needs to be curtailed as much as possible to benefit the majority, both today and in the future. 7527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence: Correspondence ID: Name:	private May,07,2010 12:26:26 Web Form I believe that allowing more off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras will enefit a few and endanger a great many more, be addition to noise there is the danger to animals, land, sea, and air from being run over. Turtle and bird nests could well Off road vehicle use needs to be curtailed as much as possible to benefit the majority, both today and in the future. 7527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence: Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 12:26:26 Web Form I believe that allowing more off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras will enefit a few and endanger a great many more, be addition to noise there is the danger to animals, land, sea, and air from being run over. Turtle and bird nests could well Off road vehicle use needs to be curtailed as much as possible to benefit the majority, both today and in the future. 7527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:26:28							
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 12:26:26 Web Form I believe that allowing more off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras will enefit a few and endanger a great many more, bu addition to noise there is the danger to animals, land, sea, and air from being run over. Turtle and bird nests could well Off road vehicle use needs to be curtailed as much as possible to benefit the majority, both today and in the future. 7527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:26:28 e: Web Form	be destroyed and young crushed.						
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 12:26:26 Web Form I believe that allowing more off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras will enefit a few and endanger a great many more, be addition to noise there is the danger to animals, land, sea, and air from being run over. Turtle and bird nests could well Off road vehicle use needs to be curtailed as much as possible to benefit the majority, both today and in the future. 7527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:26:28	be destroyed and young crushed						
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 private May,07,2010 12:26:26 Web Form I believe that allowing more off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras will enefit a few and endanger a great many more, be addition to noise there is the danger to animals, land, sea, and air from being run over. Turtle and bird nests could well Off road vehicle use needs to be curtailed as much as possible to benefit the majority, both today and in the future. 7527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:26:28 Web Form There are enough places for off road vehicles to go to now. Why are you trying to spoil quiet, delicate places with loud environment? 	be destroyed and young crushed						
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 12:26:26 Web Form I believe that allowing more off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras will enefit a few and endanger a great many more, be addition to noise there is the danger to animals, land, sea, and air from being run over. Turtle and bird nests could well Off road vehicle use needs to be curtailed as much as possible to benefit the majority, both today and in the future. 7527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 7527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 12:26:28 E: Web Form There are enough places for off road vehicles to go to now. Why are you trying to spoil quiet, delicate places with loud environment? 7528 Project: 10641 Document: 32596	be destroyed and young crushed						
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence: Correspondence ID: Name:	private May,07,2010 12:26:26 Web Form I believe that allowing more off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras will enefit a few and endanger a great many more, be addition to noise there is the danger to animals, land, sea, and air from being run over. Turtle and bird nests could well Off road vehicle use needs to be curtailed as much as possible to benefit the majority, both today and in the future. 7527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 7527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 7527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y 7528 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Doild and the context of	be destroyed and young crushed						
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence: Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	 private May,07,2010 12:26:26 Web Form I believe that allowing more off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras will enefit a few and endanger a great many more, be addition to noise there is the danger to animals, land, sea, and air from being run over. Turtle and bird nests could well Off road vehicle use needs to be curtailed as much as possible to benefit the majority, both today and in the future. 7527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:26:28 Web Form There are enough places for off road vehicles to go to now. Why are you trying to spoil quiet, delicate places with loud environment? 7528 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Dodd, Gordon May,07,2010 12:26:30 	be destroyed and young crushed						
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	 private May,07,2010 12:26:26 Web Form I believe that allowing more off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras will enefit a few and endanger a great many more, be addition to noise there is the danger to animals, land, sea, and air from being run over. Turtle and bird nests could well Off road vehicle use needs to be curtailed as much as possible to benefit the majority, both today and in the future. 7527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:26:28 Web Form There are enough places for off road vehicles to go to now. Why are you trying to spoil quiet, delicate places with loud environment? 7528 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 7528 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 8 Web Form 	be destroyed and young crushed						
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	 private May,07,2010 12:26:26 Web Form I believe that allowing more off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras will enefit a few and endanger a great many more, be addition to noise there is the danger to animals, land, sea, and air from being run over. Turtle and bird nests could well Off road vehicle use needs to be curtailed as much as possible to benefit the majority, both today and in the future. 7527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:26:28 Web Form There are enough places for off road vehicles to go to now. Why are you trying to spoil quiet, delicate places with loud environment? 7528 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Dodd, Gordon May,07,2010 12:26:30 	be destroyed and young crushed						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence Type: Correspondence Type: Correspondence Type:	 private May,07,2010 12:26:26 Web Form I believe that allowing more off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras will enefit a few and endanger a great many more, bo addition to noise there is the danger to animals, land, sea, and air from being run over. Turtle and bird nests could well Off road vehicle use needs to be curtailed as much as possible to benefit the majority, both today and in the future. 7527 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:26:28 Web Form There are enough places for off road vehicles to go to now. Why are you trying to spoil quiet, delicate places with loud environment? 7528 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Dodd, Gordon May,07,2010 12:26:30 Web Form Any off road vehicles use will ruin the prestine beauty of the land as well pollute the ground and the water, please enfor 	be destroyed and young crushed						

	0010984
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 12:26:32 Web Form 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 turles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the ped
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7530 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:26:34 Web Form DON'T 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 advocateslike youfail 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7531 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:26:34 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7532 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:26:41 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and many tother people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7533 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Knott, Thomas May,07,2010 12:26:41 Web Form Please BAN off road vehicles from being operated in the Cape Hatteras Seashore Beaches!
Correspondence ID: Name:	7534 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private

	0010985
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:26:45 Web Form 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 douse the beaches to the fullest. Clearly, endangered speciesunique to the OBX beach areaneed 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 isa 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7535 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:26:46 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7536 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, Robert May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (QRVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thure generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7537 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore: The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area. deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely esse

Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 12:26:52 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7539 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Hunt, Jill B May,07,2010 12:26:55 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7540 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses in required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for ctentin portions of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7541 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:27:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, ont ORV use. It is absolutely essential tha
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7542 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Doak, Hartson May,07,2010 12:27:00 Web Form 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, Ste	eve			
Received:	May,07,20	010 00:00:00			
Correspondence Type:	Web Forn	1			

	0010987			
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3			
Company law of De	7544 Declark 10641 Decement 20506 Delector V			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7544 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:27:08 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental lyperferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain por			
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form none.			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7546 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:27:15 Y Web Form We should be doing everything possible to save the environment. Y			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7547 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:27:15 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential			

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7548 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Van Praag, Jane L May,07,2010 12:27:24 Web Form					
Correspondence:	 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it					
Correspondence ID:	7549 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y					
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 12:27:25 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray,					
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. 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7550 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Pacey-Field, Susan L May,07,2010 12:27:28 Web Form					
Correspondence:	Off road vehicles have no place on a seashore. It causes erosion.					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7551 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:27:33 Web Form The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Rea, Michael May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thure generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife sp
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7554 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Bundy, Jennifer May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 precendence 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, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be per
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7555 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Schreier, Marguerite C May,07,2010 12:27:53 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7556 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Jones, Jay May,07,2010 12:27:55 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7557 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Samp, Cecelia May,07,2010 12:27:56 Web Form Veb Form

Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7558 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Martin, Ben May,07,2010 12:27:56 Web Form 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 distrubing 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 distrubed and damaged. These areas need to be restricted to pedsestrian access only in order to preserve the wildlife that some many people come here to experience. Allowing any Off Road Vehicles into 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7559 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:28:00 Web Form There are not enough peaceful, tranquil places left in the United States. Allowing noise and air pollution from ORV is unconscionable.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7560 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Pucak, Carol J May,07,2010 12:28:06 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7561 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Cleveland, Robert May,07,2010 12:28:09 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations. 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of pr						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7562 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 and a supporter of national parks. Lappreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft						

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with

its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7563Project:10641Document:32596PrivateprivateMay,07,201012:28:10Web FormPlease limit off-road vehicle driving on the Cape Hatteras shoreline. Our outehurricanes and pollution. The birds and turtles that make their homes in this anow!	r banks wildlife is already under enough threat from climate change,
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7564Project:10641Document:32596PrivateprivateMay,07,2010 12:28:10Web FormIt is time to put a STOP to extending privileges to OFF ROAD VEHICLES. IEnglish colony. My daughter lives in Greensboro NC and we often visit the Owho have ORV are NOT welcome in their own neighborhoods. Let them go of far between. The beaches are there for recreation. Keep them that way.	Much of the NC area is historical; remember Plymouth wasn't the first DUTER BANKS of NC. There is lots of wilderness in the USA and those
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7565Project:10641Document:32596N/A, N/AMay,07,201012:28:14Web FormThis is just like keeping snowmobiles out of Yellowstone and Yoseminite, it	should be a no brainer Keep MOTOR VEHICLES off Hatteras shore line.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7566 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Sanford, Timothy R May,07,2010 12:28:17 Web Form Please limit ORV access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore so that the n native wildlife can rebound to previous levels. If nothing else, please limit OI 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. Outer Banks used to be like! Thank you for your consideration.	RV access to a small proportion of the seashore, and reserve the rest for
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7567 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private private May,07,2010 12:28:17 Web Form ORV traffic should never override the needs of wildflife or pedestrians. ORV frankly they should not be allowed in any national park area, but if they must birds, people along a quiet beach watching and listening to the waves roll in. fumes from the engine? There are plenty of places for ORV's to go, there are and communing with nature. Please consider your actions carefully.	's are noisy, destructive to the environment and spew fumes into air. Quite be allowed, their access should be limited and heavily regulated. Think of Do you suddenly want to hear the loud noise of an ORV and smell the
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7568 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Bambrick, John May,07,2010 12:28:18 Meb Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteratits sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Bar watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalance make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in t if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Orga visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hat precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is refuture generations."	s National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement d and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that he draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, unic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all atteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7569 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:28:19 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thure generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely ess
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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 7570 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:28:36 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7571 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07.2010 12:28:36 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentali preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildemess" 3) The Knal Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7572 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:28:38 Web Form 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: Name: Received:	7573 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 grissom, ruth ann May,07,2010 12:28:39 32596

Correspondence Type: Web Form Correspondence: Dear Super

Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7574 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following peson. "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildemess" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visior experience of primitive wildemess, not Wuse. It is absolutely essential t
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7575 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Conrad, Norm May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 preason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutel
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7576 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Shelley Gompers

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7577 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 platt, audrey May,07,2010 12:29:02 Heritary Heritary Web Form May,07,2010 12:29:02 Heritary Heritary 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7578 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Nixon, James T May,07,2010 12:29:08 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7579 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:29:08 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7580 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Trimble, Peggy May,07,2010 12:29:08 Web Form 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 an 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7581 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Garcia, Mary May,07,2010 12:29:11 Herein and the second
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7582 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:29:11 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draplan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource wit its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness"

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Received:	private 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.
	7504
Correspondence ID: Name:	7584 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 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: Received:	Pavese, Robert R 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 Dear Superintendent Murray,
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.
	precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of
	future generations."
	the area, accorded to be espectantly adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shart of permaticity reserved as a primitive wildemess
	if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of the second

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Worcester, Chris May,07,2010 12:29:24 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray,
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 draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must ass
Correspondence ID:	7588 Project: 10641 Document: 32596
Name: Received:	Spaulding, Stephen J May,07,2010 12:29:27
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Daiss, Becky May,07,2010 12:29:28 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drat plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 1) When Cape Hatteras was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, and ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS prot
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7590 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Engel, Gordon R
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7591 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:29:45 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Correspondence:	Web Form				
	 Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drar plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without				
Correspondence ID: Name:	examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. 7593 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private				
Name: Received:	private 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 dra plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource wit its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative 1 if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the				
	pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the bes examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.				
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7594 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Cornelia, Jared May,07,2010 12:29:52 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray,				
	As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the dra plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource wit its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird				

its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Name:	7595 private	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y			
Received:	*	010 12:29:54								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	peace on o YOU have can be enj	ly have an imp clead pristine e the responsi joyed without	beaches. W blity to PRO using enter	OTECT our public	ge are we sen lands. NOW ributes to pol	ding by allowir DO IT! The Pa lution, global w	g that to be dest rk Service shou varming, and turn	royed by oil/gas ld be spearheadir is up the USA's o	gussling vehicle og the concept tl lisgusting appat	es. HOW IRONIC! hat the natural world tite for more oil. So
Correspondence ID: Name:	7596 private	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y			
Received: Correspondence Type:	1	010 12:29:58 n								
Correspondence:	As a mem plan to ma its sandy l watchers, privilege (make this if it is moo 1) The Na visitors an precedence future gen 2) When (the area, c Thus, the pedestrian 3) The fin analysis, t Thank you	anage Off Roa beaches, salt r and many oth ORV use over area nationall dified to inclu titional Park Sc ad wildlife and we over one for terations." Cape Hatteras leemed to be c intent of Con a visitor exper al Plan/EIS r to achieve wilu u for the oppo	tional Parks dd Vehicle (narshes, and er people w all other vi y significar de and reco rrvice canned the habitat rm of recrea was establi especially au gress was to ience to Caq ust assert N dlife specie: rtunity to pr	ORV) use on the l l maritime woods ho enjoy undevele sitors. Overall, thi it. Of the six altern gnize the followin t ignore its respon on which it depen- tion (ORVs), and shed, Congress sp daptable for recrea- protect the visitor on Hatteras and all PS authority to a s recovery goals.	beaches of Ca on the storied opped beaches is approach is native plans or gg points. Isibilities und ds. Conservi any recreation ecifically des tational uses r experience of low ORV use laptively mar nents. I appre	upe Hatteras Na d Outer Banks of . All of the alter unbalanced an utlined in the d ler the Organic ng Cape Hatter nal use is requi ignated it a par , the said area i of primitive will only if it can of lage the wildlife ciate the hard w	tional Seashore. f North Carolina natives presented d fails to conser- raft, I support th Act and the Nati as for future gen- red by law to lea c system unit for shall be permanne dermess, not OR ccur without har resources, in re- vork and dedicati	The Seashore is a. This area is chi d in the draft envi- e and protect the e identified "envi- onal Seashore's a erations and prot- we the resource ' the following re- ntly reserved as V use. It is absol- ming wilderness sponse to inform on of the Nation	a nationally sig erished by famili ironmental imp e wilderness, bin ronmentally pro- authorizing legis ecting its wildli unimpaired for a son, "Except fa a primitive wildli thely essential ti and wildlife res ation produced al Park Service	rds, and turtles that eferred" Alternative D slation to protect all ife must take the enjoyment of or certain portions of lerness" hat NPS protect the sources. by monitoring and in preserving the best
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Forn	010 12:30:00 n derstand wher	10641 e ORVs fit	Document: into a primitive w	32596 ilderness, unl	ess there is an e	mergency and the	ney are serving a	particular need	for transportation.
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	Noel, Leti May,07,20 Web Form I don't und Thank Yo 7598 private May,07,20 Web Form	itia 010 12:30:00 n derstand wher uu Project: 010 12:30:00 n	e ORVs fit 10641	into a primitive w Document:	ilderness, unl 32596	Private:	Y			-
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Noel, Leti May,07,20 Web Form I don't und Thank Yo 7598 private May,07,20 Web Form There is a	itia 010 12:30:00 n derstand wher u Project: 010 12:30:00 n Iready too mu	e ORVs fit 10641	into a primitive w	ilderness, unl 32596	Private:	Y			-
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	Noel, Leti May,07,20 Web Form I don't und Thank Yo 7598 private May,07,20 Web Form There is a 7599 private May,07,20 Web Form I would si pristine as	ritia 1010 12:30:00 n derstand wher u Project: 010 12:30:00 n Iready too mu Project: 010 12:30:05 n mply ask that 5 Cape Hattera	e ORVs fit 10641 ch vehicle a 10641 you avoid a s should be	into a primitive w Document: access to the beach Document:	ilderness, unl 32596 nes around Ca 32596 vehicles on C t that - pristin	Private: ape Hatteras. No Private: Cape Hatteras N ne.	Y othing should be Y S. There are cert	done that will al	low even more	-

Thank you for your time and consideration!

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7601 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Benjamin, James L May,07,2010 12:30:11 12:30:11
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, 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 E if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain protions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur with
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7602 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:30:11 Web Form 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 animal and plant life. Who are the powerhorses 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?
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7603 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Durrenberger, Joe May,07,2010 12:30:17 Web Form While the majority of off-roaders are responsible, far too many are not. Their careless ,reckless actions can not be excused.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7604 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Amsden, Liz May,07,2010 12:30:18 May,07,2010 12:30:18 Web Form 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. 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. Noise pollution, air pollution, habitat endangerment, despoiling of foliage, ruining of nesting areas, killing of animals & birds, injury of hikers - all for what? We've seen it in Yosemite and elsewhere. It has to stop. Just say NO to ANY "sports" off road vehicle use Cape Hatteras National Seashore area. Now and forever.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7605 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:30:29 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7606 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:30:31 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative E if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7607 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the dra plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife must take percedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thure generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide
	an improved final ORV management plan. ************************************
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7608 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Aughey, Arlene May,07,2010 12:30:36 Web Form Web Form We al know the time has long come to preserve this precious piece of Earth.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7609 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Morgan, Linda G May,07,2010 12:30:40 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7610 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:30:42 Web Form Veb Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7611 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Williams, Donna E May,07,2010 12:30:44 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7612 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Rosenthal, Ann May,07,2010 12:30:45 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drawn of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drawn of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drawn of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drawn of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drawn of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drawn of the National Parks

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7613 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Rubel, Scott May,07,2010 12:30:57 Web Form There are plenty of natural places being handed over to offroad vehicles. This does not need to be one State of the second se	of them.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7614 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:31:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a parent, grandparent, and supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significan and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family va who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact st. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternat the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV us pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in responanalysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication o examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an 	nt resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, nationers, bird watchers, and many other people atement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Is that make this area nationally significant. Of the ive D, if it is modified to include and recognize as Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all ions and protecting its wildlife must take the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of following reason, "Except for certain portions of reserved as a primitive wilderness" e. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the g wilderness and wildlife resources. use to information produced by monitoring and of the National Park Service in preserving the best
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7615 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:31:05 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appr plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. Th watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve an make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the ide if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience on primitive wilderness, not ORV us pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in responsing analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication o examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an 	Seashore is a nationally significant resource with his area is cherished by family vacationers, bird the draft environmental impact statement d protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that entified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all ions and protecting its wildlife must take he resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of following reason, "Except for certain portions of reserved as a primitive wilderness" e. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the g wilderness and wildlife resources. use to information produced by monitoring and of the National Park Service in preserving the best
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7616 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:31:13 Web Form	

Correspondence Type:

Web Form

0011002 **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 10641 **Correspondence ID:** 7617 Project: **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 May,07,2010 12:31:17 **Received: Correspondence Type:** Web Form Please keep Off Road Vehicles (ORVs) out of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Correspondence: **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 unecessary Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I urge you to reconsider - more nature, less noise and pollution. Thanks! **Correspondence ID:** 7620 **Project:** 10641 32596 Y **Document: Private:** private Name: May,07,2010 00:00:00 **Received: 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? 7621 10641 32596 **Correspondence ID: Project:** Document: Beaven, Nancie Name: May,07,2010 00:00:00 Received: **Correspondence Type:** Web Form **Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative 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 protested 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 12:31:25 Web Form 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
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7623 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:31:31 Y Y Web Form Recreational vehicles have no place on either desert or coastal sands. Only damange to our environment and wildlife result from this senseless "sport".
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7624 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Cox, B. Lea May,07,2010 12:31:33 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7625 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:31:40 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7626 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:31:41 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7627 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 12:31:41 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7628 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Kaplan, David A May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental Impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following points. 3)
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7629 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 vchicles. 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 vchicles 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 Vchicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, are antionally significant. To objy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, bird, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. To the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over of form of recreation (QRVs), and any recreational Use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore is
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7630 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:31:51

 Received:
 May,07,2010 12:31:51

 Correspondence Type:
 Web Form

 Correspondence:
 My wife and I are relative new comers to

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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7631 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Norris, Joanne W May,07,2010 12:31:53 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 pe
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7632 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:32:06 Y<
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7633 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:32:08 Web Form 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 environnment and the peace and tranquility of the entire park. We have roads all over this country and these ORVs should only be used on roads, not here. What are they thinking!!!! PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS TO HAPPEN!!!!!
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7634 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Purcell, Regina G May,07,2010 12:32:09 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7635 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:32:19 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 we 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 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, r and obnoxious few who think all enjoyment comes from speed and noise. I urge you to keep the Cape Hatteras National Seashore vehicle free.	air
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7636 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 scharf, william c May,07,2010 12:32:21 Web Form Stop the ATVs.	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7637 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Frederick, Gwen A May,07,2010 12:32:24 Web Form 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 vehic 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 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? human beings are reverting backwards sometimes.	re people
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:32:25 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resoure its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Altern if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to prote visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portit the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protec pedestrian visitor experi	rce with , bird s that native D, ect all t of cions of ct the g and edication
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7639 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:32:34 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7640 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:32:35 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resourp its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Altern if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protee visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain port the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protec pedestrian visitor experience to Cape H	rce with , bird s that native D, ect all t of cions of ct the

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: Received:	private 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
Common an dom on ID:	examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Correspondence ID: Name:	7642 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Will, David
Received:	May,07,2010 12:32:52
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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: Name:	7643 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Day, Linda A
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 12:32:58 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: Name: Received:	7644 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Wiewandt, Thomas A 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: Name:	7645 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received:	May,07,2010 12:33:04 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of
	future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of

the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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 Mar: 07 2010 12:22:05
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 12:33:05 Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drar plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
	3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and
	analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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 Web Form
Correspondence Type: 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
correspondence:	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, i
	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 inevitibly
	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: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 12:33:06 Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray,
	As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
	2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the bes
	examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7649 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Henry, Devin May,07,2010 12:33:07 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draplan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with
	its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative

if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name:	7650 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Received:	George, M.S. May,07,2010 12:33:20
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray,
	As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, 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
Correspondence ID: Name:	7652 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:33:27 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of

future generations."

Name:

private

 When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received:	7653 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Brust, Angela C May,07,2010 12:33:29 12:33:29
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7654 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Webb, Jeanette May,07,2010 00:00:00 Webb Webb Webb Form 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, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species r
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7655 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 12:33:39 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft nervironmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for
Correspondence ID: Name:	

	0011011								
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to 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 harm								
Correspondence ID:	7657 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y								
Name: Received:	private May 07 2010 12:33:41								
Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 12:33:41 Web Form								
Correspondence:	PLEASEno 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: Received:	private 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								
	As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thure generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use our without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS aut								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7659 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:34:01 Web Form As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the comment are of an econgrist the precedence over one provide the precedence has especifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the comment are comment." 								

 When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7660 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 miller, russell h May,07,2010 12:34:09 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7661 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:34:10 Web Form Isolarity
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7662 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Darrow, Delana R May,07,2010 12:34:14 Web Form Been strating a nieghberhood trash pickup and been helping replant thr roads in my area,getting children involed cleaning up gardening
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7663 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence:	 Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, and ewildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources in response to information produced
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7664 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:34:21 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7665 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 LaFlamme, Jeff P May,07,2010 12:34:27 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 2) When Cape Hatteras was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is ab
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. 7666 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Hinrichs, Pamela J May,07,2010 12:34:35 Web Form Please protect open spaceour beachesfrom 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7667 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:34:36 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and manitime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely ess
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7668 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 12:34:41 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thut egenerations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for re

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Received: M Correspondence Type: W Correspondence: N an If B Correspondence ID: 7 Name: pp Received: M	NO GOOD will come wand then gain pollution are examples of human If the beach is pristine,	from fuels, tragedies an		s access to be						
Correspondence: N ai If B Correspondence ID: 70 Vame: pi Received: M	NO GOOD will come wand then gain pollution are examples of human If the beach is pristine,	from fuels, tragedies an		s access to be						
Name: pr Received: M			Web Form NO GOOD will come with allowing off-road vehicles access to beach areas. It's a guarantee to lose wildlife, their habitats with the noisees, plant life, and then gain pollution from fuels, beer and soda cans, trash from partiers and weekend warrors' activites. California beaches, ocean, rivers, lakes, all are examples of human tragedies and damages. If the beach is pristine, there is a reason it is pristinehumans haven't yet tried to destroy it for others. Ban off-road vehicles and enforce it!!!							
Received: N	7670 Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y				
Correspondence: A pl it: w pr m fi 1) vi pr fu 2) th T T T S 3, au T S	plan to manage Off Roa its sandy beaches, salt r watchers, and many oth privilege ORV use over make this area national if it is modified to inclu 1) The National Park So visitors and wildlife and precedence over one fo future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras the area, deemed to be o Thus, the intent of Con- pedestrian visitor exper 3) The final Plan/EIS r analysis, to achieve wil Thank you for the oppo examples of America's	d Vehicle ((narshes, and er people wi r all other vis ly significan de and recog ervice canno 1 the habitat rm of recrea was establis especially ad gress was to ience to Cap ust assert N dlife species rtunity to pr natural and a ****** Tha	ORV) use on the b maritime woods ho enjoy undevelo sitors. Overall, thi t. Of the six altern gnize the followin t ignore its respon on which it deper- tion (ORVs), and shed, Congress spe- laptable for recrea protect the visitor be Hatteras and all PS authority to ad recovery goals. ovide these comm cultural heritage fin nk you very much	beaches of Ca on the storied oped beaches, s approach is ative plans o g points. Isibilities und ids. Conservi any recreatio ecifically des tional uses experience of ow ORV use aptively man ents. I apprea or future gene for taking th	pe Hatteras Na l Outer Banks All of the altte unbalanced ar utlined in the of ler the Organic ng Cape Hatte nal use is requ ignated it a par , the said area of primitive wi only if it can of age the wildlift ciate the hard we reations. I look the time to proto	ational Sei of North C ernatives p and fails to draft, I sup e Act and t ras for fut ired by lav rk system shall be p lderness, n occur with fe resource work and d forward t ect one of	barks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft bashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird presented in the draft environmental impact statement conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that pport the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all ture generations and protecting its wildlife must take w to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the nout harming wilderness and wildlife resources. es, in response to information produced by monitoring and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. 'America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea Thanks again!			
Vame: pi Received: M Correspondence Type: W Correspondence: It da re	damaged and destroyed	over recreation. These p	tional vehicles is compleneed to do	crap. It should	t be saved so e	everyone c	s so many years to create most of these sites and to let it be can enjoy it. Driving all over it destroying what cannot be enjoy and not just the few that want to hot rod thru the area			
Name: pp Received: M Correspondence Type: W Correspondence: D A pi iti w w pp m ifi 1; vi y vi f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f	 7672 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:34:49 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the dra plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore: The Seashore is a nationally significant resource witi is sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, dual and y eccentral or plans outlined in the draft or support. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations."<!--</td-->									
1	7673 Project: N/A, N/A	10641	Document:	32596						

 Received:
 May,07,2010 12:34:53

 Correspondence Type:
 Web Form

 Correspondence:
 Leave the beaches for the natural things...

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7674 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:35:01 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally prefered" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must ass
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7675 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:35:05 Web Form There can be no excuse for allowing disproportionate access by off-road vehicles to Cape Hatteras National Seashore, shortchanging pedestrians, quiet recreationsists and wildlife. 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. We must stand up the the assault by motorized vehicles on our natural environment. Quite recreation, such as that practiced by pedestrians, birders, campers and hikers not only makes a much lighter footprint on the land but conserves
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	fossil fuels for essential uses. DO NOT ALLOW OFF-ROAD VEHICLES ON ANY NATIONAL SEASHORE. Sincerely, Randa Robinson-Anderson 7676 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:35:13 Web Form 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.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7677 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Hill, Kimberly J May,07,2010 12:35:15 Methods Methods Methods Web Form 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. Thank You.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7678 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Tranberg, Debra M May,07,2010 12:35:19 Web Form Please do not ORV use at Cape Nat'l Seashore. This can only adversely affect habitat and other less invasive use. Debra M. Tranberg, D.C.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7679 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Sunde Jr, Robert J May,07,2010 12:35:21 Web Form 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!
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7680 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with

its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name:	7681 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 12:35:38 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the dra plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource wit its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpared for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7682 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Yingling, Jacob May,07,2010 12:35:41 Web Form 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 is economic plight is disappointing and disheartening.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7683 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Gilbert, Sandy J May,07,2010 12:35:43 Web Form Stop the ORV from invading pristine places for our wildlife, it's their home !!! My God, can't we save anything for the animalsdo we have to put our dirty feet and autos and garbage EVERYWHERE!!!!!!!!!
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7684 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 12:35:48 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draplan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource wit its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7685Project:10641Document:32596Gehman, Betsy & SteveMay,07,201012:35:54Web FormDear Superintendent Murray,
	As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of
	 a) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. b) Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received:	7686 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Starr, Andrew May,07,2010 12:35:56 12:35:56
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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 sanctuariesa 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 nowdo you REALLY THINK this is appropriate?
Correspondence ID: Name:	7687 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 12:36:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and mary other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and al
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7688 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:36:07 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7689 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:36:11 Web Form Please do not allow off road vehicles on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7690 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Ostrom, Gavin A May,07,2010 12:36:28 Web Form 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 beachess of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach i unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and a
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7691 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Watson, John S May,07,2010 12:36:29 Web Form Please protect native wildlife by banning off-road vehicles in Cape Hatteras
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7692 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y mixu,07,2010 12:36:32 Web Form Inave 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7693 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Souza, Julie May,07,2010 12:36:41 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildlerness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wildlerness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pede

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7694 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Andersson, Linda L May,07,2010 12:36:47 Web Form							
Correspondence:	Web Form 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.							
	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?							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7695 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Little, Vicki L May,07,2010 00:00:00							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, 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 vehic 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. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the dra plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource wit its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habita on which it depends							
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the be examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. ************************************							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7696Project:10641Document:32596N/A, N/AMay,07,201012:37:05Web FormORVs destroy habitat and the environoment. Keep them out!							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7697 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:37:08							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form This is a stupid idea to have ORV on the beach. It will ruin the envoirment 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7698 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:37:11 Web Form							
	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 environmen							
Correspondence: Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: 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 environmen 7699 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:37:12 Web Form URGENT: DONT LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE! Thank you.							

shorebirds, and less on noisy, polluting, environmentally damaging Off Road vehicles.

would disproportionately dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrians. This would be a desceration 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

Correspondence ID:	7701 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y						
Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form						
Correspondence:	 Ive 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 tranquility 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) Wh						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7702 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Rosenfield, Ralph R May,07,2010 12:37:28						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7703 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wildlemess, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildlemess" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wildlemess, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) T						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7704 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Hoch, Elizabeth A May,07,2010 12:37:52 Web Form Please preserve this National Shoreline - we don't know some noisy all-terrain vehicles running everything.						

	0011021
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Sopala, Laurence V May,07,2010 12:38:02 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7706 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:38:03 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7707 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:38:09 Web Form 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 Cage Hatteras National Seashore: The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primi
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7708 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:38:26 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this apprech is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produ
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7709 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is

All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points: 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received:	7710 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Gintz, Aimee J May,07,2010 12:38:36								
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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 HatterasAnd tourist dollars are in demand. Thank you for your time, Aimee								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7711 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:38:52 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative E if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area as shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely e								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7712 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use: is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely ess								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7713 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Schueth, Steve May,07,2010 12:38:59								

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

Correspondence Type:

Correspondence:

Web Form

Dear Superintendent Murray,

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 12:38:59 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harmin
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7715 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:39:05 Web Form As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, all marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery g
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7716 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Wilder, Dwain May,07,2010 12:39:13 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7717 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:39:23 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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. Cape Hateras National Seashore is one of the last "undeveloped" beaches within driving distance from our residence and our favorite destination. Please

Cape Hateras 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Forn	010 12:39:26 n	10641 isaster herae	Document:	32596 v, this isn't e	ven a fun activi	ty and the	e animals that live there need their space, as we humans do.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Forn I fully sup Please put	port the banni t the preservat	ion of this p		National Par			nicles are an endangerment to wildlife and the environment. terest groups. As we've learned, once these natural resources
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form Please con damage ha animal life	nsider the cons as been done t e. After dirt ro eserve your op	o our wild l ads are form	ands due to ORV	use. Once an paved roads a	area is opened	for ORV	in Utah an unquantifiable and unimaginable amount of use, the area becomes less habitable for native plant and occurs. Quiet places in nature are getting harder to come by.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Forn The word corporate dogs, have everyone	010 12:39:33 n "public" mean sports teams a e picnics, or fl	tre taking or y a kite bec if they can't	ver all the open sp ause they will be i t drill oil or whate	aces with ast n the way of	ro turf, lighting the Special Or	g, etc., etc les. This i	ee this happening to our local parks, where organized . All at taxpayer expense. Now the "Public" can't walk their s politics at the lowest levels. Leave public land alone. Not t. No one person or group can dominate it, either. Get it?
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form Dear Supe As a mem plan to ma its sandy l watchers, privilege 0 make this if it is moo 1) The Na visitors ar precedence future gen 2) When 0 the area, 0 Thus, the pedestriam 3) The fin analysis, t	010 12:39:38 n erintendent Mi iber of the Nat anage Off Roa beaches, salt n and many oth ORV use over area nationall dified to inclu titional Park Se d wildlife and e over one for herations." Cape Hatteras leemed to be e intent of Cong a visitor experi al Plan/EIS m o achieve wild u for the oppo	ional Parks d Vehicle (narshes, and er people w all other vi y significan de and reco rrvice canno l the habitat m of recrea was establic specially ac gress was to ience to Ca ust assert N dife species rtunity to pr	ORV) use on the b l maritime woods ho enjoy undevelo sitors. Overall, thi it. Of the six alterr gnize the followin t ignore its respor on which it deper tion (ORVs), and shed, Congress sp daptable for recrea protect the visitor be Hatteras and all PS authority to ad s recovery goals.	beaches of Ca on the storied pped beaches s approach is lative plans or g points. Isibilities und ds. Conservi any recreation ecifically des tional uses e experience of ow ORV use aptively mar eents. I appre	ape Hatteras Na d Outer Banks . All of the altes s unbalanced ar butlined in the of der the Organic ing Cape Hatte onal use is requi- ignated it a pau , the said area of primitive wi only if it can of age the wildlif ciate the hard v	ational Se of North G rnatives p Id fails to lraft, I sup Act and t ras for fut ired by lav k system shall be p lderness, n occur with e resource vork and d	barks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf ashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird oresented in the draft environmental impact statement conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that oport the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all ure generations and protecting its wildlife must take w to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of ermanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the tout harming wilderness and wildlife resources. es, in response to information produced by monitoring and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7723 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Artin, Thomas May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7724 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 uses is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2. When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3. The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in re
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7725 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7726 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:39:52 Web Form Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7727Project:10641Document:32596N/A, N/AMay,07,201012:39:58Web FormYou're cooperation and support would be much appreciated.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7728 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Maddox, Charles E May,07,2010 12:40:03 Web Form 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,

Correspondence ID:	7729 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May.07.2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type:	Web Form
orrespondence:	 Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the dra plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource wit its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions or the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harm
Correspondence ID:	ruined for visitors current and future. Please!! Sincerely, Tar Heel resident and taxpayer, Nancy C. Foster Greensboro, NC 7730 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type:	Web Form
	plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
	2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
	turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again! Sincerely, William Smith Cincinnati, Ohio
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7731 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the dra plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

	Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name:	7732 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private						
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:40:26 Web Form 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 machiner?? 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 12:40:37						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft neuronmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife r						
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Schneider, Allyn S May,07,2010 12:40:38 Web Form For the sake of wildlife please eliminate ORVs from Cape Hatteras National Seashore.						
Correspondence ID:	7735 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y						
Name: Received:	private May,07,2010 12:40:41						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7736 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:40:49 Web Form						
Correspondence:	 I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are 						

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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: Received:	private May,07,2010 12:40:54							
Correspondence Type:								
Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants ar							
	as breeding ones.							
Correspondence ID:	7738 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name: Received:	private 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 rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as we as breeding ones.							
Correspondence ID:	7739 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name:	private							
Received:	May,07,2010 12:40:59							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.							
	*							
	The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.							
	The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consisted with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as w							
	The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, a least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consiste with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be							

correspondence in.	1140	I I Ujecti	10041	Document.	52570	1 11/4
Name:	private					
Received:	May,07,	2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web For	rm				

Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total 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 guidline, 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 provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	as breeding ones. 7741 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:04 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at parcach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife retered plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, b						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7742 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:05 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, whic was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, thi approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection on the based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7743 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:05 Web Form As a resident of North Carolina and a frequent visitor to national parks and Cape Hatteras specifically. Lappreciate the opportunity to comment on						

Web Form 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 greater perestrian access, which was identified in the plan as in disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

Correspondence:

0011029

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

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

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are 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: Name: Received:	7744 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:05						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it						
Correspondence ID: Name: Boosived:	examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. 7745 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:10						
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.						
	 The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7746 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:10 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a						

chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7747 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:10							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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 consisten with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife recovery. Where there are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7748 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:10 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, an							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7749 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 12:41:10 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protecti							

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7750 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:11							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:41:11 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather							
Correspondence ID: Name:	7751 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private							
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:41:11 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its rece							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7752 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:16 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underprin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7753 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:17							

 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: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 12:41:21 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7755 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:21 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding bids and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual rev
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7756 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 12:41:21 Web Form Iappreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7757 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:21 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recover
Correspondence ID:	implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. 7758 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7759Project:10641Document:32596Marshall, Robert TMay,07,2010 12:41:26Web FormProtect the beach.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7760 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 12:41:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include cl

	0011035
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7761 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental preferred alternative. This alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmental preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underprin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only I6 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be cons
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7762 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 12:41:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, an
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7763 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan vould provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realiz
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7764 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:27 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore bound for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds,						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7766 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07.2010 12:41:33 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7767 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:41:33						

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals 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: Received: Correspondence Type:	Surmay, Lori M May,07,2010 12:41:36 Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3
Correspondence ID: Name:	7769 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Baughman, Carol
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:41:38 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7770 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:42:04 Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7771 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:42:07 Web Form This noisy, brutal mayhem has got to stop. It has already damaged too many delicate natural areas.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7772 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:42:15 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name:	7773 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:42:18 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur witho
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7774 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Mueller, Sally C May,07,2010 12:42:22 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7775 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thure generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response. I is absolutely essential that
Correspondence ID:	7776 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y

Correspondence ID:	7776	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2	010 12:42:36					
Correspondence Type:	Web For	n					

Correspondence:

0011039

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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7777 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Hassett, Todd
	As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentali preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must as
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7778 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:42:51
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form No off-road vehicles! Keep the Cape quiet and clean! It would be a disgrace to do otherwise.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7779 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Berg, Peter May,07,2010 12:42:55 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations. 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:43:09 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thure generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

7781 **Correspondence ID: 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 fragil 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 McCarty, Natasha R Name: Received: May,07,2010 12:43:19 **Correspondence Type:** Web Form Correspondence: Stop !!! **Correspondence ID:** 7783 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 Olander, Alan Name: **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 7784 Y **Correspondence ID: Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Name: private May,07,2010 12:43:40 **Received: Correspondence Type:** Web Form Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative 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 private Name: May,07,2010 12:43:40 Received: **Correspondence Type:** Web Form **Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

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

me.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7786 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:43:40
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7787 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:43:40 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
	The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 7788 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:43:40 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

me.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7789 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:43:40
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
	 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7790 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:43:49 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
	*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel as breeding ones.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 7791 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:43:49 Web Form Y Y
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

me.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7792 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:43:49
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Multiply (7) (2010 12:43:49 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round on non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could them more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals,
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. 7793 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:43:49 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the
	alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turt
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7794 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:43:49 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

me.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7795 Project: private May,07,2010 12:43::	10641 55	Document:	32596	Private:	Y		
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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: Name:	7796 Project: private	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y		
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:43:55 Web Form I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important							
	*Provide Equal Acce 16 of the 68 total mi least half of the beac approach would prov chance to rebound to * Put Natural Resour consistent with this p migrating, and winte are minimums and sl * Establish and Meet management targets degraded abilities. W implemented until re as breeding ones.	ss for All Vis es of Seashorn h should be av- ride balanced its traditional cces First. Prot rotection. The ring species. V nould be incre Clear Goals 1 in the DEIS, t /here birds, tu covery goals a portunity to p	itors. Under the Na e beach. This does vailable year round access for all visite numbers and dive ection of the natur e preferred plan fai Wildlife protection ased if necessary to for Wildlife Recov- hey need more tho rttles, and plants ar- are met. These goal rovide these comm	ational Park a not represen for non-OR ors. Pedestria rsity within t al resources ls to set asid must be bass o protect bre- ery. A plan r rough vetting e not coming ls, and adequ nents. I will t	Service's prefer t a fair balance V users and wi ns and familie: he park. and wildlife of e adequate area ed on the best s eding birds and nust include cli g based on the b back as planne tate manageme	ear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent ed, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be ent to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as wel he progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more		
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	alternative plans pres provide greater pede This alternative plan me. The following princi *Provide Equal Acce 16 of the 68 total mi least half of the beac approach would prov chance to rebound to * Put Natural Resour consistent with this p migrating, and winte are minimums and sl	rtunity to con sented in the d strian access. would provid ples should ur ess for All Vis es of Seashor h should be av ride balanced its traditional ces First. Prot ces First. Prot protection. The ring species. V	raft environmental e more opportunity iderpin the park's fi itors. Under the Ni e beach. This does vailable year round access for all visito numbers and dive tection of the natur e preferred plan fai Wildlife protection ased if necessary to	impact state ormulation of ational Park i not represen for non-OR ors. Pedestria rsity within t al resources ls to set asid must be bass o protect bre-	ement, I suppor V uses of the l of its final plan, Service's prefet t a fair balance V users and wi ns and families the park. and wildlife of e adequate area ed on the best s eding birds and	Y d plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the rt the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to , should it not choose to enact Alternative D: rred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only e for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at ildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this s could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a f the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be as that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan d sea turtles.		

 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7799 Project: 10641 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:43:58 Web Form No! No! No!	Document:	32596	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7800 Project: 10641 private May,07,2010 12:44:01 Web Form It is dangerous having vehicals v		32596 Private: Y offroad vehicals leak toxic fluids.	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	would gladly give up my drives	on the sand if it mea	32596 Private: Y on the beaches. But what I go to the Outer Banks for is the unspoiled, open beaches and w nt the beach would not become a thoroughfare with animal and bird carcasses. Please do n tiful islands. You know that people will always abuse the laws and I fear for the fragile eco	not
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Aside from the noise issue, there With ORVs allowed to buzz acr riders themselves. That, along w	ax and enjoy the sou e are safety and envir oss a beach, there is ith the contaminants tants as well - the an	32596 nd of the ocean's waves, not to hear the obnoxious rumble of ORVs. ronmental issues to consider as well. the risk and liability of injuries to those trying to enjoy the beach, and to the ORV drivers a that ORVs will leave on the beach (oil, , fuel, tire fragments, etc.), will ruin the beach for imals and sea life that reside there.	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:		as as a child. We dro and have the same n	32596 Private: Y ove from Kentucky to play on the beaches and visit the lighthouse. Please keep the shore cl nemories as I do There's no need to tear up such a beautiful place for off-roaders. There a sees as special as Cape Hatteras.	
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	plan to manage Off Road Vehic its sandy beaches, salt marshes, watchers, and many other peopl privilege ORV use over all othe make this area nationally signifi if it is modified to include and re	rks Conservation As le (ORV) use on the and maritime woods e who enjoy undevel r visitors. Overall, th cant. Of the six alter ecognize the followin	32596 sociation and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resor on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationer oped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement is approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtle native plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alter ng points. nsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to pro	urce with rs, bird tt es that ernative D,

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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.

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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7805 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 smith, ian May,07,2010 12:44:21 Web Form
Correspondence:	do not let our beaches be ruined by traffic.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7806 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may,07,2010 12:44:22
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7807 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:44:32 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental preferred" Alternative D. if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential tha
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7808 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:44:34 Web Form Last year was our firt 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 it's eco balance for years to come. There are enough area to ride ATVs in the united states. Thank you for your consideration. Here are an
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7809 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness,"

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name:	7810 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Albano, Louis G
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May.07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with tis sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, bird, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the had work a
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7811 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Lima, Paul May,07,2010 12:44:52 Web Form I urge strict limits on ORV use. The noise, pollution and destruction of flora and fauna must not be permitted to continue.
correspondence.	Tuge surce mints on OKV use. The noise, pondulon and destruction of nora and fauna must not be permitted to continue.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7812 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Norquist, Raun May,07,2010 12:44:59 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7813 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:44:59 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, bird, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential tha
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7814 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:45:08 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray.

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,

Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7815 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:45:09
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form Based on my experience of with livingwith access to both a national wildlife refug and a national seashore, I wish to express with all the force at my command my opposition 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7816 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Rowan, Thomas J May,07,2010 12:45:13 May,07,2010 12:45:13 Web Form 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 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7817 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental! preferred" Alternative I 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 acundant 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 in 1) The National Park Service cannot ginore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's utilization to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain porti
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7818 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Norkus, Edward May,07,2010 12:45:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form Correspondence: Use both 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7819 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Carter, Pat May,07,2010 12:45:26 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7820 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Tarr, Richard May,07,2010 12:45:39 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7821 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Harris, Ann S May,07,2010 12:45:40 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7822 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 "environmentall impact Statement to precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational use:, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7823 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 pierce, patrick g May,07,2010 00:00:00 100:00:00 100:00:00

	0011050
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7824 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Charland, Chadd C May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 H
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7825Project:10641Document:32596Private:YprivateMay,07,2010 12:45:46Web FormI'm for leaving the wild areas wild.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7826 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wildemess, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildemess" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by mon
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7827 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y may.07,2010 12:45:54 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7828 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Stadnik, George May,07,2010 00:00:00 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 a
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7829 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:45:59 Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3
Correspondence ID: Name:	7830 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Duckworth, Ron
Received:	May,07,2010 12:46:03
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of
	 future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7831 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:46:06 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7832 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Vasily, Karen May,07,2010 12:46:06 Web Form Image: Constraint of the second sec
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drat plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with tits sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7833 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:46:13 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the drad plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plants. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 7 Mus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7834 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Stutes, Earl A May,07,2010 12:46:15 May.07,2010 12:46:15 Web Form 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: Name:	7835 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, Wanda 32596

	0011033
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 wildlife resources" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert
	examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7836 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:46:22 Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7837 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Reisman, Emil May,07,2010 12:46:27 Web Form off road activities do not allow other beach uses - the beaches belong to all
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7838 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:46:43 Web Form please, care for the planet
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7839 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 wick, jodi L May,07,2010 12:46:49 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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:	
Name: Received:	7840 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:46:53
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form 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 natrual 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 visitng 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 activites that should be permitted inside a national park. Sincerely, Mandi Adkins
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7841 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 kuligowski, rebecca a May,07,2010 12:46:58 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 eat and won't sustain life of an 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7842 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:46:59 Web Form 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 presentatives/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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7843 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:47:08 Web Form 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 beautifully 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:	

	0011055
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7845 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:47:16 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7846 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 12:47:19 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7847 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, You have the power to make a difference! As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D. if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildleness" 2) When Cape Hatteras was established. Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said the permanently reserved as a primitive wildleness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wildlenes, and wildlife resou
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7848 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:47:46 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7849 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:47:46 Y Web Form Please keep beaches quiet and beautiful. Any type of motorized vehicles spoil the atmposphere 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7850 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 12:47:50 May,07,2010 12:47:50 May,07,2010 12:47:50 Web Form 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. 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 alterated by these machines - not everyone is careless - but some are dangerous. Ideally - the States if they are going to take fees for registrations they should provide them a legal place to ride - a safe place. You can't mix walking traffic with off road traffic or horses. Good luck! From an x-owner of a 4 wheeler - I sold becuase of the other dangerous drivers.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7851 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Carlson, Alan L May,07,2010 12:47:52 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a long-time member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments

on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7852 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Hathaway, Susan May,07,2010 12:48:05 Web Form
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7853 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:48:06 Y Web Form 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 beprotected.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7854 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thure generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS auditively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitori

turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again! Sincerely, Joanne Hesselink

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7855 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Markgraf, Steven May,07,2010 12:48:14 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray. Dear Superintendent Murray.							
	 Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental impact statement privilege to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wil							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7856 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:48:24 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7857 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:48:25 Web Form Please adopt a modified Alternative D proposal of the draft EIS. 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! Thank you, Bryan Tarbox							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7858 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:48:33 Web Form 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 conductive to the quiet and peacefullness I desire when visiting the beach. Certainly the life forms that need an undisturbed home do not appreciate ORV molestation.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7859 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Crawford, Gayle May,07,2010 12:48:33 Web Form We're having enough troub le with oil in the Gulf. Lets not destroy yet another ecosystem just so off road vehicle junkies can get their jollies.							
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7860 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Baker, Richard G May,07,2010 12:48:36 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatters and allow ORV use only if it can occur wi							

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name:	7861 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 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 dra plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource wit its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative i if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) T							
	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							
	its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."							
	2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedicatio of the National Park Service in preserving 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:	Tylenda, Elton W May 07 2010 12:48:52							
Received: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 12:48:52 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 shor term profits and political expediency.							
Correspondence ID:	7864 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y							
Name:	private							
Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form							
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray,							
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 I							
	if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.							

if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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 soughing 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7865 Project: private May,07,2010 12:48:58 Web Form Please, no Off Road Ve Don't let self centered h		•			Y
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	plan to manage Off Roa its sandy beaches, salt r watchers, and many oth privilege ORV use over make this area national if it is modified to inclu 1) The National Park So visitors and wildlife and precedence over one fo future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras the area, deemed to be of Thus, the intent of Con- pedestrian visitor exper 3) The final Plan/EIS m analysis, to achieve wil Thank you for the oppor examples of America's	tional Parks d Vehicle narshes, an er people v all other v y significa de and reco ervice cann t the habita cm of recre was establ especially a gress was to ience to Ca ust assert 1 dlife specie natural and ****** Th	(ORV) use on the b d maritime woods who enjoy undevelous isitors. Overall, thin it. Of the six alterri- genize the followin ot ignore its resport t on which it deperation (ORVs), and ished, Congress spi- daptable for recrea- protect the visitor pe Hatteras and all VPS authority to ad s recovery goals. rovide these commi- cultural heritage finance and the spin second and you very much	beaches of C on the storie oped beaches s approach i ative plans of g points. Isibilities un ds. Conserv any recreation ecifically dea tional uses experience ow ORV use laptively main nents. I appre- or future ger h for taking t	ape Hatteras Na d Outer Banks 4. S. All of the alte s unbalanced ar outlined in the of der the Organic ing Cape Hatter onal use is requisignated it a part , the said area of primitive wi e only if it can of nage the wildlif sciate the hard wilder he time to protect	Y national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft ational Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird ematives presented in the draft environmental impact statement d fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that traft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all ras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take ired by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of tk system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Iderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. The resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. ect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea on today. Thanks again!
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	plan to manage Off Roa its sandy beaches, salt r watchers, and many off privilege ORV use over make this area national if it is modified to inclu 1) The National Park Sa visitors and wildlife and precedence over one fo future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras the area, deemed to be d Thus, the intent of Con pedestrian visitor exper 3) The final Plan/EIS r analysis, to achieve wil Thank you for the oppor	tional Parks d Vehicle narshes, an er people v all other v y significa de and reco rvice cann l the habita rm of recre was establ especially a gress was to ience to Ca ust assert 1 dlife specie rtunity to p	(ORV) use on the b d maritime woods who enjoy undevelous isitors. Overall, thin the other states and the originize the followin of ignore its respon- tion which it deper- ation (ORVs), and ished, Congress spi- daptable for recrea- pert of the visitor pe Hatteras and all VPS authority to ad s recovery goals.	peaches of C on the storie pped beaches s approach i hative plans of g points. Isibilities un- ids. Conserv any recreation ecifically de- tional uses experience ow ORV use laptively man	ape Hatteras Na d Outer Banks s. All of the alter s unbalanced ar butlined in the of der the Organic ing Cape Hatter onal use is requ signated it a para of primitive wi e only if it can on hage the wildlif eciate the hard w	national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf ational Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird rmatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement df ails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative E Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all ras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take ired by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of rk system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Iderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. Fe resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

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."

When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7869 Project: Roberts, Barry W May,07,2010 12:49:29 Web Form Someone has to care	10641	Document:	32596			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	plan to manage Off Road its sandy beaches, salt m watchers, and many othe privilege ORV use over a make this area nationally if it is modified to includ 1) The National Park Ser visitors and wildlife and precedence over one forr future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras w the area, deemed to be es Thus, the intent of Cong pedestrian visitor experie 3) The final Plan/EIS mu analysis, to achieve wild Thank you for the opport	onal Parks Vehicle (arshes, and r people w all other vi significar e and reco vice cannot the habitat n of recrea vas establi pecially ac ress was to rece to Ca st assert N life specie: unity to pi	(ORV) use on the b d maritime woods of the enjoy undevelo isitors. Overall, this ist. Of the six altern- ognize the following of ignore its respon- t on which it depen ation (ORVs), and a shed, Congress spe daptable for recreat o protect the visitor pe Hatteras and allo IPS authority to ad- s recovery goals.	eaches of Ca on the storiec ped beaches s approach is ative plans o g points. sibilities und ds. Conservi any recreatio ecifically des tional uses experience of ow ORV use aptively man ents. I appre	pe Hatteras No l Outer Banks . All of the alte unbalanced au utlined in the of ler the Organic ng Cape Hatte nal use is requ ignated it a pa , the said area of primitive wi only if it can age the wildlin ciate the hard v	ational Sea of North C ernatives pr nd fails to c draft, I supp : Act and th ras for futu ired by law rk system u shall be pe lderness, n occur with fe resources work and do	arks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft shore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with 'arolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird resented in the draft environmental impact statement conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that port the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D ne National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all ure generations and protecting its wildlife must take v to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of ermanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" ot ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the out harming wilderness and wildlife resources. s, in response to information produced by monitoring and edication of the National Park Service in preserving the best o seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7871 Project: Targon, Elvira M May,07,2010 12:49:36 Web Form Keep all vehicles off the	10641 beaches. F	Document: Preserve the delicat	32596 e balance of	nature as muc	h as possib	le.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	I have been visiting Cape North Carolina's Outer B Hatteras is a small presen I feel off road vehicles w much harsher environme to joyriders. Not to ment I understand many peopl its untouched state and n preserves part of the unit	the NPS is 6 thatteras anks in its ve of that ould great ntal impaction the sm e enjoy ric nany bird v ue Outer 1 loped beac	my entire life and r s relatively pristine, wild, completely u ily degrade Cape H ct. I'm sure fragile s ell of exhaust fume ling off road vehicl watchers and photo Banks' ecosystem.	make several , untouched s nique landsc atteras. Nois and dunes, r es on the nor es, but many graphers do	trips there a y state. The Oute ape. e alone would mally aromatic others enjoy of as well. The at	ear. I love er Banks ard harm the a and turtle m c sea breeze Cape Hatte traction of	National Seashore. I strongly oppose this. it because it offers a glimpse of the unique landscape of e quickly losing many of their natural treasures and Cape appeal of the shore. But the vehicles would likely have a testing sites, and protected sea oats would quickly fall victim e. rras for its natural beauty. I know my family and I love it for an undeveloped seashore brings money to the area and a special place that my family and I love and it is worth

	0011001
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7873 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Ebershoff-Coles, Susan May,07,2010 12:49:43 Meb Form 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 irreplacable 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7874 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:50:06 Web Form 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 Seashor The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thure generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experienc
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7875 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 VAN_WAGNEN, HEIDI May,07,2010 12:50:10 Web Form CAPE HATTERAS AND ALL OF OUR NATION'S BEACHES ARE THE EASTERN, SOUTHERN AND WESTERN CRUST OF OUR NATIONYES, 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 BEGINCAPE HATTERAS? AND WHERE DOES IT END? WHO WILL BENEFIT IN THE BEGINNING OF IT'S DESTRUCTION. HEIDI SHAY VAN WAGNEN
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7876 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Miner, Samuel May,07,2010 12:50:12 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7877 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Decker, Mary Gail May,07,2010 12:50:13 Web Form 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 that what God would want us to do for his creatures?
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7878 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 McGuire, Tim M May,07,2010 12:50:17 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7879 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:50:21 Web Form								
Correspondence:	Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7880 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:50:32 Web Form Y 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7881 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Michalowski, Joe D May,07,2010 12:50:46 Web Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D. if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations. " 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress spec								
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7882 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:50:58 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative E if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses								

Correspondence ID:	7883	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
--------------------	------	----------	-------	-----------	-------	----------	---

	0011063						
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 12:51:09 Web Form 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 ca						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7884 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 12:51:18 Mey borm May,07,2010 12:51:18 Mey borm 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 Parks Sornice cannot impact the following points.						

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness... Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Forn	Project: 010 12:51:30 a clean enviro	10641 nment.	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Forn We are su preserved	010 12:51:48 n rrounded even beach. Take	some time to		r the future o		ons. The last thing we need is to allow off road vehicles on this at is already swimming in oil spills and choked with carbon dioxide. The
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Web Form Dear Supe As a mem plan to ma its sandy th watchers, privilege (make this if it is moo 1) The Na visitors am precedence future gen 2) When C	erintendent M ber of the Na anage Off Roz oeaches, salt r and many oth ORV use over area national dified to inclu tional Park Sc id wildlife am e over one fo erations."	tional Parks ad Vehicle (narshes, and er people w : all other vi ly significar de and reco ervice canno d the habitat rm of recrea was establi	ORV) use on the I maritime woods ho enjoy undevel- sitors. Overall, th t. Of the six altern gnize the followir of ignore its respon- on which it depen- tion (ORVs), and shed, Congress sp	beaches of C on the storie oped beaches is approach i native plans (ng points, nsibilities un nds. Conserv any recreation eccifically de	ape Hatteras Na d Outer Banks s. All of the alte s unbalanced ar putlined in the o der the Organic ing Cape Hatte onal use is requ signated it a par	Y national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft ational Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird ernatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, e Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all ras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take ired by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of rk system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness"

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name:	7888 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Johnston, Catherine
vame: Received:	May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type:	Web Form Creatings Superintendent Murray
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 opportunites 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: Received: Correspondence Type:	private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7890 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all the draft of
	visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must 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: Name: Received:	7891 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Fredrickson, John May,07,2010 12:52:01 12:52:01		
Received: May,07,2010 12:52:01 Correspondence Type: Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit c plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally sign its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental imprivilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, bit make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally pre if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legis visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlif precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilde Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, in response to information produced I analysis, to achieve			
Correspondence ID:	7892 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y		
Name: Received:	private 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, destuctive 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: Received:	Shiebler, Chuck 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		
Correspondence ID:	7894 Project: 10641 Document: 32596		
Name: Received:	N/A, N/A 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."

When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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.

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7895 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Black, Angela May,07,2010 12:52:22 Web Form I urge you to adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting that which makes Cape Hatter abundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore.	eras so special
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7896 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:52:30 Web Form Please eliminate any private vehicles from the beaches. I object to the noise, pollution/exhaust odor and beach erosion these vehicle 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7897 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 THAMES, JOEL E May,07,2010 12:52:32 Web Form Do we really need gas operated motor vehicles (ORVs) speeding around and endangering lives on Cape Hatteras? Did I mention the polution? What are you thinking?	e noise and the
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7898 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit c plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally sign its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impa precedence to ORV use over all other visitors. Here in Alaska, we can clearly see the detrimental effects of unmanaged ORV (ATV 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 Overall, your approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area national six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to incl the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legisly visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations," 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildle Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential th pedestrian visitor experiences recovery goals. The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife	ificant resource with y vacationers, bird act statement give /) use in the wetlands r the land. Illy significant. Of the lude and recognize lation to protect all fe must take the enjoyment of or certain portions of emess" iat NPS protect the ources. by monitoring and n preserving the best
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7899 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:52:35 Web Form 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 precious resource	prevent erosion of a

precious resource.

0011067			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7900 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:52:37 Web Form		
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildlerness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wildlerness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.		
Correspondence ID: Name:	7901 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Grubb, Karen Y		
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Unitor, Katell 1 May,07,2010 00:00 Web Form 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 recr		
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7902 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:52:44 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D,		
	if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.		

	0011088
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 12:52:45 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and al
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7904 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate 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 ORV's use of the area. A few reasons are: ORV's 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 prefered" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially ad
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:52:53 Web Form 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 uses is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS auth
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7906 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Stewart, Dr. John M May,07,2010 12:52:54 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

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of

(2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7907 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Seibert, Bob May,07,2010 12:53:03 Web Form					
Correspondence:	 Web Form As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative E if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to ada					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7908 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Farrington, Raymond May,07,2010 12:53:10 Web Form 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 Seashor is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use: , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreati					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7909 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf 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 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."

When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7910 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Kolkey, MFT, Zora L May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form					
Correspondence:	Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore it responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife res					
Correspondence ID:	7911 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y					
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	private May,07,2010 12:53:37 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7912 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:53:37 Web Form Deer Superintendent Murray					
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.					

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7913 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:53:48 Web Form As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilder		
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7914 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:53:50 Web Form Please preserve Cape Hatteras Please preserve Cape Hatteras Please preserve Cape Hatteras		
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7915Project:10641Document:32596Private:YprivateMay,07,201012:53:54YWeb FormLetting off-road vehicles go "off-raod"!!!!!!		
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7916 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:54:00 Web Form We must keep all our public lands from being altered or damaged so that future generations may enjoy them too. Private: Y		
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7917 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Schoemer, Karen May,07,2010 12:54:05 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draf plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with tis sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental preferred" Alternative I if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final PlanzEIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and ana		
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7918 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:54:12 Web Form PRESERVE not allow for DISTRUCTION. Form Form		
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7919 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 B, Jeremiah May,07,2010 12:54:35 Web Form 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: Name:	7920 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y						
Received:	private 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 t 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 oth people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions o the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness,						
	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 Web Form						
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Dear Elected officials,						
correspondence.	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.						
Common an dom oo ID.	7923 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y						
Correspondence ID: 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 oppportunity 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: Correspondence:	Web Form I really love this area						
correspondence.							
Component TD	7025 Deciset 10641 Decomposite 20506						
Correspondence ID:	7925 Project: 10641 Document: 32596						
Name: Received:	Daly, Julia 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 plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bi watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles th make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternati if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portion the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring ar analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I apprec			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7927 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:55:08 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and may other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential th			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7928 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:55:32 Web Form As we watch what is happening to our Gulf coast it is more important than ever to protect these places so fragile. So fragile.			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7929 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,O7,2010 12:55:35 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness," Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS pr			
Correspondence ID:	7930 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: V			

Correspondence ID:	7930	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,07,2	2010 12:55:38					
Correspondence Type:	Web For	m					

Correspondence:	DODITO74 Approving an off road vehicle use on this beach would do permanent damage to wildlife and also be dangerous for pedesterian 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 destory 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7931 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Miller, Nancy May,07,2010 12:55:39 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7932 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:55:44 Web Form 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 varoius 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7933 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:55:51 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 2) When Cape Hatteras was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Pl			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7934 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Feeley, Janet May,07,2010 12:56:02 Web Form We must stop ATV's from damaging delicate areas in NC and other parts of the United States. Our eco systems are in danager 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 may of our precious natural areas. Our wildlife is suffering as well, maybe more then us. Thank you.			
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7935 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras			

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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7936 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Young, Nancy L L May,07,2010 12:56:09 Web Form Please restirct off-road vehicles on Cape Hateras.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type:	7937 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:56:14 Web Form
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7938 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:56:15 Web Form Off-road vehicles are noisey and they tear up the beach. Image: Content of the second
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7939 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:56:16 Web Form I encourage you to rethink allowing ORV traffic is 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7940Project:10641Document:32596N/A, N/AMay,07,201012:56:24Web FormThe seashore is for animals, not for vehicles!
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7941 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Hubbard, James May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate 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 recreati

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7942 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:56:31 Web Form V ORVs do not belong in Cape Hatteras NS period. V V V					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7943 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Hughes, Andrew May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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.					
	Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.					
	 The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7944 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Potter, Sondra E May.07,2010 12:56:35 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental inpact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS prot					
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	an improved final ORV management plan 7945 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:56:42 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7946 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Voska, Kenneth J May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft					

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Sincerely, Kenneth J. Voska

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7947 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:56:54 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7948 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 toher 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 rese
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7949 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 i unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thure 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 t

Correspondence ID: 7950 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y Name: private

	0011078
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft nervironmental inpact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visions and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wild
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7951 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate 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 ge
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7952 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:57:09 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7953 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Mecke, Mike B May,07,2010 12:57:12 Web Form 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 emmissions 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7954 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 12:57:20 Web Form Please keep off road vehicles out of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Correspondence ID: Name:	7955 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private

	0011079
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	May,07,2010 12:57:24 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if i can occur without harming wildern
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7956Project:10641Document:32596Stearns, Joan EMay,07,201012:57:24Web FormPlease keep off-road vehicles out of Cape Hatteras.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7957 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Morotti , Gloria J May,07,2010 12:57:41 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7958 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 McChesney, Tim May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate 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 unblanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras, system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational use, the sid area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildlerness" Thus, the inten of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely esse
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7959 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 craciun, george J May,07,2010 12:57:56 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7960 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:57:59 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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:	Web Form			
Correspondence ID:	DON'T LET OFF ROA	D VEHICL	ES DOMINATE (CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	plan to manage Off Roa its sandy beaches, salt n watchers, and many oth privilege ORV use over make this area nationall if it is modified to inclu 1) The National Park Se visitors and wildlife and precedence over one for future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras the area, deemed to be c Thus, the intent of Cong pedestrian visitor experi 3) The final Plan/EIS m analysis, to achieve wild Thank you for the oppo	ional Parks d Vehicle (aarshes, and er people w all other vi y significan de and reco rvice canno the habitat m of recrea was establis specially ac gress was to ence to Ca ust assert N llife species tunity to pr	ORV) use on the b I maritime woods the enjoy undevelo sitors. Overall, thi t. Of the six altern gnize the followin t ignore its respon on which it deper tion (ORVs), and shed, Congress sp daptable for recrea protect the visitor be Hatteras and all PS authority to ad s recovery goals.	32596 ociation and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird oped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement s approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that ative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D g points. usibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all dds. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of ecifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of tional uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" "experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the ow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. aptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and tents. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best or future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	plan to manage Off Roa its sandy beaches, salt n watchers, and many oth privilege ORV use over make this area nationall if it is modified to inclu 1) The National Park Se visitors and wildlife and precedence over one for future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras the area, deemed to be e Thus, the intent of Cong pedestrian visitor expert 3) The final Plan/EIS m analysis, to achieve wild of the National Park Se an improved final ORV	ional Parks d Vehicle (larshes, and er people w all other vi y significan de and reco rvice canno the habitat m of recrea was establit specially as tress was to ence to Cap ust assert N llife species vice in press manageme ****** Tha ds, and gend	ORV) use on the b I maritime woods ho enjoy undevelo sitors. Overall, thi it. Of the six altern gnize the followin on which it depen- tion (ORVs), and shed, Congress spe- laptable for recrea protect the visitor be Hatteras and all PS authority to ad s recovery goals. T serving the best ex nt plan. mk you very much	32596 ociation and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird ped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement s approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that ative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D g points. isibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all dds. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of ecifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of tional uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" • experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the ow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. aptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and hank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication amples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea till be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Wedlock, Eldon D May,07,2010 12:58:19 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime 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 wildlerness, bird, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, IF it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take preceduce over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely e
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7966 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:58:26 Web Form 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! Willa Schmidt Madison, WI
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7967 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:58:31 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7968 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Murbach, Randy May,07,2010 12:58:42 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: Name: Received:	7969 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Anderson, William D May,07,2010 12:58:46
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use 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/E
Correspondence ID: Name: Received:	7970 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:59:05
Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative E if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildlerness" 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7971 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 similarl a nationally significant resource, feasturing 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

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all

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 unimpared 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: Correspondence Type:	May,07,2010 12:59:12 Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3						
	examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.						
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7973 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:59:12 Web Form Earth's environmental history is rife with decisions made in favor of human preferences & activitiesusually 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 existencesbut 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: Name: Received:	7974 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 12:59:21 Web Form						
Correspondence Type: 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 beachs 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7975 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y May,07,2010 00:00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.						

	0011084					
	 The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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??? **********************************					
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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7977 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Heathcoat, Elaine A May,07,2010 12:59:44 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft					
	 plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by m					
Correspondence ID:	7978 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y					
Name: Received:	private 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7979 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Wood, Barbara L May,07,2010 12:59:51 Web Form 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: Received:	private 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.

Dorothy Elsaesser

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7981Project:10641Document:32596Private:YprivateMay,07,201013:00:30Web FormPlease help
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7982 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Laurson, Ed J May,07,2010 13:00:39 Web Form Please protect all beach areas in America. We need to save coastal wildlife and from erosion that would occur.
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7983 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 13:00:40 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7984 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Kelemen, Frank May,07,2010 13:00:42 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7985 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Matheny, MaryJo H May,07,2010 13:00:45 Web Form A protected national beach and its wnviourn 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7986 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 13:00:48 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7987 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y Private: May,07,2010 13:00:56 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of thut egnerations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following presented at the NPS protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/ElS must assert NPS authorit

Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	0011086 7988 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 13:01:11 Web Form Save our seashoresall of them! Save our seashoresall of them! Save our seashoresall of them!
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7989 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 13:01:13 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7990 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May,07,2010 13:01:17 Web Form 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: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7991 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Barber, Terry L May,07,2010 13:01:25 Web Form 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 Ferry L. Barber
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7992 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Coddington, Tom L May,07,2010 13:01:36 Web Form 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 can4t believe that our National Park Service would even consider opening up these protected lands to that kind of destruction! Please keep the beaches and she seashore for the use of pedestrians to enjoy and see wildlife. Thank you, Tom Coddington
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7993 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07.2010 13:01:37 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" 2) When Cape Hatteras was established
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7994Project:10641Document:32596Private:YprivateMay,07,2010 13:01:40Web FormPlease save Cape Hatteras
Correspondence ID:	7005 P roject: 106/1 D ecument: 32506

	0011007
Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over one form of recreation to find to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations. 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wi
Comon and an ID.	7006 Projects 10641 Decuments 22506 Director V
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	7996 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y private May.07,2010 00:00:0 Web Form As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wildemess, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wildemess," 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be specially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7997 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Farmer, Betsy H May,07,2010 13:01:49 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness" Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protec

	0011088
Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	Hines, Nolan F May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form 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 wildemess, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations, and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to lea
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	 7999 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 N/A, N/A May,07,2010 13:01:56 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmental] preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a minitive wilderness" 3) The final PlanzEIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring an
Correspondence ID: Name: Received: Correspondence Type: Correspondence:	8000 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 flannery, rebecca g May,07,2010 00:00:00 Web Form Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement

loped beaches. All of the alternative ople who enjoy undevel privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness.... Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

please, let this beautiful place stay, relaxing, serene, and pristine! it is is a real treasure!