

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8001	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Kenagy, David					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:02:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	National Parks have been peaceful, interesting places for my lifetime. Good. The noise and stench and pollution and safety hazard from offroad machines has no place in our wonderful National Parks. KEEP THEM OUT! Thanks David Kenagy Albany, Oregon					

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8002	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Hartman, Kathleen E					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:02:17					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a bird watcher and wildlife enthusiast (and member of the National Parks Conservation Association), I ask you to please significantly limit vehicle use -- particularly off road vehicles -- on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. There are few environments that have the beauty and ecological diversity of Cape Hatteras and I believe it is important to allow this area to flourish as undeveloped land. Off road vehicles would increase noise levels, damage sensitive wildlife areas, and threaten families on foot. I ask that you both adopt Alternative D and amend Alternative D to further protect Cape Hatteras as the phenomenal wilderness that it is. Last year, my husband and I visited the Bombay Hook National Wildlife Refuge in Delaware. It was a fantastic experience and we would otherwise never have visited Delaware. We will continue to spend our vacation time birding and visiting wildlife refuges. Cape Hatteras is on our to do list now and I hope it stays there thanks to careful management by the National Park Service. Thank you.					

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8003	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Petersen, Tod L					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please preserve responsible offroad motorcycle access. We strongly support protecting endangered plants and wildlife at Cape Hatteras, but believe that motorcycle travel should be allowed to continue where appropriate, including areas where larger ORV and cars are not appropriate. Tod Petersen Legislative/Land Use Coordinator Northwest Motorcycle Association 16015 62nd Ave NW Stanwood, WA 98292-5680 Email: tod701@aol.com					

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8004	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Conrad, William G					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:02:33					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Regardless on fiscal constraints we must be ver vigilant with our national treasures.					

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8005	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:02:37					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is vital to keep the Cape Hatteras seashore free of any and all motorized vehicles because of the irreparable damage they can cause, let alone the safety hazard to people walking the beach.					

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8006	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Baratta, Eric					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:02:43					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing to ask that you implement an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds and a human use that is based in pedestrian activity, not vehicular use. Vehicular use of Cape Hatteras Seashore should be limited to where it will not impact wildlife or hikers, paddlers or other park users. Thank you very much for your consideration- Eric Baratta					

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8007	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Sheridan, Theresa					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:02:46					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep the natural beauty of our beaches and parks intact. Thank you.					

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8008	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:02:59					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please support The Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS (DEIS) evaluates the impacts of several alternatives for regulations and procedures that would carefully manage ORV use/access in the Seashore to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources and natural processes, to provide a variety of visitor use experiences while minimizing conflicts among various users, and to promote the safety of all visitors.					

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8009	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Lovejoy, Nancy S					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:03:01					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird					

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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:** 8010    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Epshteyn, Aneah  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:03:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8011    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

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

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

PLEASE...I beseech you...DO THE RIGHT THING to protect this fragile and irreplaceable ecosystem from further harm. Thank you.  
Also please recognize that the peace and quiet of undisturbed nature is in short and precious supply. Thank you again.

Yours sincerely,  
Christina Farnsworth Director Joy in Motion Music Therapy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8012    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:03:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement

privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8013    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. I personally get a little agitated when national parks and resources are put into question to satisfy the few who want to run ORVs on beaches or carry guns in the parks or submit the land to deforestation. I sometimes wonder if we have become a bunch of crazies sacrificing the beauty that we should be preserving for personal wants or gains. 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,  
Judith Gifford

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8014    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. \*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again! Sincerely,  
Katherine A Owens

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8015    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Herrera, Fabian  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:03:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8016    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:04:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't approve the Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We don't need to keep making the same mistakes about preserving our environment that continue to degrade ecosystems. This should NOT be allowed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8017    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Species, Scott  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:04:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'd just like to say that i do not support continual year-round access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore area by ORV's. This area isn't a parking lot. If it was up to me, i'd close about 90% of the total area to any motorized vehicle use year-round. I'm sure there are wildlife critters who need protection of their habitat and would like areas of the sea shore off limits to OVR's too. respectfully submitted by, Scott Species Seattle, WA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8018    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:04:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There are so few places where one can find quiet and enjoy the beauty of a natural setting. It would be tragic to permit off road vehicles to disturb nature's bounty.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8019    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Montapert, Anthony  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:04:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose off road vehicles at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I urge you to adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement. The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over off road vehicles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8020    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Swanson, Gerald C  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:04:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live in a rural area in Florida. A public skeet shooting park was opened a mile from my house. While it is only open on Wed, Sat, and Sun, it impacts greatly on the peace and tranquility I had sought when I first moved to this area. I can imagine what ORVs would be like in an area where people also go to commune with nature. Please do not allow the use of ORV in Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8021    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Goodman, Alice  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:04:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best

examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8022	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.07,2010 13:04:37						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Fisherpeople and big dirty ORV's need to be severely restricted on ALL beaches! Especially during mating/breeding and raising the young season. I try to be nice and respectful to the ORV, water and snow machines and humans associated with them but they make it very difficult. All the ones I run into while I'm birding are loud and obnoxious and certainly do not respect what I'm doing which needs QUIET and clean environments. Whenever I walk by these people I see drinking (illegal), smoking (butts put out in the sand) and loud yelling screaming kids simply destroying the beach and god forbid they have a motorized 4 wheeler or motorcycle for the "kids" to play on.</p> <p>A permit and LIMITED numbers of humans on LIMITED beach areas(so they have to live and play in the filth they make)is necessary. This has already been instituted in other parks that are overrun with humans. Also fees would discourage lots of people who are only interested in ruining the experience for others. I've paid up to \$10 for a permit to bird a QUIET area.</p> <p>The argument of "I've always done this" is NOT valid!! Change happens, I used to be young and 160lbs. Fisherpeople and ORV's are NOT endangered BUT the wildlif that makes it's home there is and I know I like to live in clean quiet places to raise the young. The bottom line is there are too many humans trying to live on this planet and not enough resources to go around.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8023	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.07,2010 13:04:37						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Considering the immense damage being done to our environment, via such things as the recent oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, ORV's being allowed in Yellowstone, invasive species in The Great Lakes, at some point there must be something that is sacred. The beaches of Cape Hatteras may see remnants of the oil spill, so why can't we protect something from being over-run by invasive humans. Cape Hatteras has been a quiet and pristine environment for years. Please keep it that way.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8024	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May.07,2010 13:04:38						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Please take into consideration all impacts to environment before you make a ruling. These precious lands need to be protected - they are disappearing too rapidly. Our little grand child will never have the opportunity to enjoy their beauty once they are gone. Thank you, v iams</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8025	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>I am writing regarding the draft plan to open up the beached of Cape Hatteras to Off Road Vehicles. I have visited Cape Hatteras many times, and always njoyed the peace and quite there. Opening up that park to offroad vehicles will damage the park, just as much as snowmobiles can ruin Yellowstone.</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs). When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically said that the area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Letting it become the Daytona Beach of North Carolina is not what Congress had in mind.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8026	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.07,2010 13:04:42						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>The impact of motor vehicles on sandy beaches is harmful to the natural plant, animal and ocean wildlife. For this reason, recreational motor vehicles should not be permitted to cruise beaches in an unregulated manner. Any allowances for motor vehicles must be based on scientific evidence that the consequences allow for such use.</p> <p>Eugene R Heise, PhD</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8027	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May.07,2010 13:05:01						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>There must be places in our country that need to be protected from the demand for the constant thrill and noise seeker. Cape Hatteras is one. Just because you can afford an off road vehicle does not mean you can drive it anywhere you want.National Parks and Recreation areas should be places where the thrill you receive comes from Nature not 4 wheels.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8028	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Mit5chell, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May.07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>PERSONALLY, I think some entity could build an ORV play area farther inland, charge an admission for all riders, put up viewing/picnicking areas at a few points, AND KEEP THESE MACHINES OFF OUR BEACH, away from the nesting turtles, and never allow them to destroy (and you KNOW THEY WILL!) dunes, quiet, and plant and animal life!</p>						

I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore should be cherished, protected, and you are suggesting opening it, year around???? Come on! What is this really about? All of the alternatives presented in the draft impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is ecologically insane. 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 can ONLY (and under emotional duress) support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over ANY form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
  - 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
  - 3) The final Plan/EIS must 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: PERSONALLY, I think some entity could build an ORV play area farther inland, AND KEEP THESE MACHINES OFF OUR BEACH, away from the nesting turtles, and never allow them to destroy (and you KNOW THEY WILL!) dunes, quiet, and plant and animal life!
- Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. While I normally appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service people in preserving America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations, I am totally appalled at this possible plan for Cape Hatteras.. I look forward to seeing a hugely improved final ORV management plan, or the complete removal of this path direction, for the sake of my park..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8029    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Polacca, Brenda  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:05:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It has been well documented the damage that off road vehicles cause to ecosystems due to habit degredation, noise pollution, disruption of migration patterns, the list goes on. In fragile ecosystems such as sea shores there is also the concern regarding dunes, fragile plants and creatures that come on shore to lay eggs. There is also the human consideration. The last thing I want to see and hear when I am in nature is the noise, dust and general disturbances that ORV produce, not to mention that to generalize the folks that use them are particularly distasteful, disrespectful and completely oblivious to the needs of others. In short keep ORV off of our sea shores, national forest, public lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8030    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Rands, Gordon P  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks. I am also a former resident of North Carolina. I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The National Seashore is a vital component of the National Park system, with extremely high natural and recreational values, and with a storied history. I am very concerned about the draft ORV management plan. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement give precedence to ORV use over all other visitors. Such an approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
  - 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
  - 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
- While ORV users deserve access to areas in which to engage in this form of recreation, that does not mean that they deserve such access on all or most public lands. The natural qualities, importance to wildlife, intent of the enabling legislation, and the decreased opportunities for freedom from exposure to motorized recreation all support a far more restrictive management plan than is represented in the draft document. Please revise Alternative D with respect to the three points noted above, and choose this as the plan to govern ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8031    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Alicandu-Thurman, Maria G  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:05:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,  
Maria G Alicandz-Thurman

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8032	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Petty, Carlene L					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:05:28					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I am writing to urge you to adopt Alternative D regarding management of off road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. ORVs are notoriously noisy and destructive to wildlife habitat. In the case of Cape Hatteras beaches, such vehicles could easily smash turtle eggs, crabs hiding in the sand and other sand denizens, as well as disturb the many birds that flock to the tideline.</p> <p>Cape Hatteras is a very special place to me personally. I have walked its beaches at dawn and dusk, watching the waves roll in, quietly observing the plovers and other birds, collecting shells. This kind of experience would be greatly disrupted by the presence of ORVs rampaging up and down the sand. More importantly, ORVs could damage the habitats of creatures who either live or migrate through there. We have a responsibility to insure that these plants and animals are not threatened by human activities. It is difficult enough with wildernesses disappearing everywhere for plants and animals to survive.</p> <p>Thank you for allowing me to comment.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8033	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:05:30					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	cmon have some decency not to rape everything in sight					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8034	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:05:31					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>With respect to Cape Hatteras National Seashore, there needs to be a better Off Road Vehicle management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds. What you are about to approve now for Off Road Vehicle 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 for far too many years into the future. I would think the National Park Service would know better. Shame on you!</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8035	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:05:36					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jeff Pearlman</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8036	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Hustvedt, Annie M					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."</li> </ol>					

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Annie M. Hustvedt

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8037	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Hofing, Amy L					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. There are many opportunities for ORV use in other locations that do not risk the pedestrian visitor experience. The potential for harm to unspoiled beaches and wildlife by ORV use is great at Cape Hatteras. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8038	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Gorr, Richard					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:05:58					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Are you trying to destroy all quite and peaceful areas of the country? KEEP THOSE NOISEY MACHINES AWAY FROM PUBLIC LAND!!!					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8039	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	rinaldo, jean					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:06:04					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	So called off road vehicles are completely useless and are the worst polluter.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8040	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:06:05					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Sir, It is with every hope that I write to you requesting the limitation of Off Road Vehicles on the beaches at Cape Hatteras, NC. It has been well documented that this type of vehicle causes serious degradation to the surface areas of use and often disturbs wildlife as well. The damage that will be done to the fragile grasses that hold the beaches and its other delicate flora must be taken into consideration. The turtle population does not need any more disruption to their nesting sites and I cannot imagine the baby turtles dodging ORVs on their way to the sea. The other issue at hand is the noise level from these vehicles. They may make the Indy 500 sound tame but the decibels emitted are ear drum shattering. Thank you for your consideration of my request. Sincerely yours, Suzanne M. Roth					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8041	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:06:10					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I've enjoyed vacationing on the Outer Banks and Cape Hatteras, and I shudder to think how ORVs would churn up the beaches, endanger nesting shorebirds, and add noise pollution to the sounds of calling seagulls and surf.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8042	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Ongerth, Steve					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:06:20					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Off-road vehicles are devastating to the ecosystem.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8043	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	



**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:06:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Time to eliminate vehicles on the beach

**Correspondence ID:** 8044    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason: "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, NOT ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8045    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cosgrove, Christine  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:06:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off-road vehicles are destructive to environment/habitat, and loud, disruptive and annoying to human visitors!

**Correspondence ID:** 8046    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hartholz, Steven B  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:06:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. Wildlife are a vital part of our livelihoods, and we must protect and resiliante their habitats to the best of our ability.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8047    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:06:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect our coastal areas from destruction!

**Correspondence ID:** 8048    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:06:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8049    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Copithorn, Fred H  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:06:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I urge you to include more area for nesting birds in the plan for Cape Hatteras beaches. It is wrong and undesirable for ORVs to subsume so much beach front to the point that wildlife suffers and people who want to enjoy natural areas are prevented from doing so. Thank you. Fred Copithorn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8050    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks I want to go on record as being totally against the use of Off Road Vehicles on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. However, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8051    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hale, Angela E  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:07:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8052    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hoff, Michelle L  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:07:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a supporter of national parks, a hiker, nature lover, wildlife lover, and someone who has been to national parks all over the U.S. I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the

wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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!

**Correspondence ID:** 8053    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Monroe, James R  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:07:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** With the increased number of off road vehicles in the U.S. it is important that we regulate where they are allowed. National Parks and Forests should uniformly ban ALL off road vehicles. I am sure that Theodore Roosevelt intended National Parks to be meant as a place to get away from the noise pollution of cities and to get in touch with Nature. The destruction that off road vehicles create is well documented from noise pollution, to vehicle exhausts, to habitat loss. Please refrain from allowing off road vehicles in National Parks and Forests.  
While you are at it, get the cattle off OUR public lands, too.  
Thank you.  
James R. Monroe [www.MonroeScienceEd.com](http://www.MonroeScienceEd.com)

**Correspondence ID:** 8054    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Craib, Jim  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:07:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8055    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:07:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off-road vehicles on Cape hatteras. Do you realize the number of delicate ecosystems you will destroy? Do you realize the amount of trash that will be discarded, entering the ocean and becoming unsightly? Please help us to preserve the dignity of the beauty of our national resources. Off-road vehicles destroy habitats, pollute the air, and bother people who come to enjoy the majesty of nature.

**Correspondence ID:** 8056    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:08:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
Please do not allow off-road vehicles to spoil a beautiful stretch of seashore. Place the emphasis on pedestrian usage and wildlife management, not on gas-guzzling, smoke-belching, noisy vehicles.  
Sincerely, Robert Glover Concerned Citizen

**Correspondence ID:** 8057    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Malley, Karen A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:08:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Cape Hatteras as pristine as possible. It is one of the most unique spots the U.S. has, and to open it to off road vehicles would be it's quick demise. What it offers is peace and nature. The vehicle traffic would take away both of these things. Karen Malley

**Correspondence ID:** 8058    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:08:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Cape Hatteras National Seashore vehicle FREE. Our world is too congested as it is and there need to be natural spaces free from the world technology, noise, pollution and disturbance.

**Correspondence ID:** 8059    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Holloway, Heather  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:08:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Heather Holloway

**Correspondence ID:** 8060    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Shorin, Robert  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:08:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please preserve and protect our seashores. They are natural treasures that are our responsibility to maintain for future generations. Too often we give in to corporate profit-oriented interests at the expense of the general public. We already have too much NOISE surrounding us, and TRAFFIC, and CONCRETE. The seashore should be maintained as a quiet refuge for visitors, and as an unspoiled habitat for the wildlife. IT IS NOT A PROPER PLACE FOR MOTORCYCLES SPEWING GAS FUMES AND DISTURBINGLY LOUD ENGINES.  
Thank you.  
Mr. and Mrs. Robert Shorin 30 Wynn Court Syosset, NY 11791-2426 RShorin@aol.com

**Correspondence ID:** 8061    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Germain, Thomas  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:08:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Having grown up two blocks from the Atlantic and having camped and surfed at Cape Hatteras, I can't imagine opening the beautiful beaches there to year-round ORV use. The impact on the beach wildlife, including birds and the very vulnerable and interesting land crabs that burrow and live in the dry sand, will be devastating. This idea is neither sensible nor responsible. Very restricted use of ORVs is already a significant compromise between our recreational interests and our duty to protect the natural beauty and the native species there. Very restricted use is the only responsible policy to maintain. Allowing year-round ORV use on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore will be irresponsible and disastrous for that wonderfully interesting and beautiful environment.

**Correspondence ID:** 8062    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gach, Andrew  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:08:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel that wildlife protection and pedestrian access should take precedence over the rumble of off-road vehicles at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Please reflect this in your management plan. Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 8063    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Draper, Barry  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:08:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras is a unique and irreplaceable wildlife area that should be protected from the devastation of ORV's . Coal mines and other man made disaster areas should be open for these obtrusive machines . I live in NH and have seen only negative results where public lands have allowed such vehicles. The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Thank You , Barry Draper

**Correspondence ID:** 8064    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hall, Silvia A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:08:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8065    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:09:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8066    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:09:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the Outer Banks National Park safe for pedestrians and nesting wildlife rather than opening it for greater off-road vehicle use. Recall the accident in Florida several years ago where an ORV drove over two teenage girls who were sunbathing resulting in their deaths. The National Park should not be a place where people enjoying the beach or dunes should have to worry about being the next vehicular death. I doubt the Park Service wants to deal with the legal ramifications.  
Additionally, there is the damage to nests of birds and turtles who have relied on the desolate beaches for millenium in order to perpetuate the species. Shrinking habitat, climate change, and other environmental hazards are already taking a huge toll. We can at least continue to provide a measure of safety by limiting ORV access to the beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8067    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:09:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
My family and I are from Virginia and North Carolina. For many years of our lives, we had the great opportunity to experience the beauty of the eastern state, the islands and Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We would like to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.  
Our love of our national parks, including Cape Hatteras National Seashore, is based on the pristine condition that they have been kept in. These sandy beaches, salt marshes, and woods with their varied wildlife are best enjoyed for the quiet and even solitude that they provide. Why? Because these lands are undeveloped and uninfringed upon by too much "civilization." The only way to keep these lands this way for now and future generations to enjoy is to greatly restrict the impact of ORVs on the environment.  
Of all of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement, privileges for ORV use predominate over all other visitors. This is very bad management to say the least. Your job is to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area of great national significance. There are six alternative plans outlined in the draft. Of those, we support the one identified as "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, only if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." As you can see, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. Preferably, ORVs should not be allowed at all since they do harm wilderness and wildlife resources through the abuse that they are infamous for in other national parks.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. We do appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations despite all the pressures from special interests to compromise or abandon these duties to the American people and our protected lands. We look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8068    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:09:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a supporter of and frequent visitor to national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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:** 8069    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** sailer, randy  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:09:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i am against allowing orv traffic on the cape hatteras national seashore as the damage to this sensitive area would be irreversible.please drop the orv use from the final use plan.thankyou.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8070    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:09:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8071    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Starr, David S  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:09:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8072    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:09:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8073    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kranz, David L  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:09:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

This is as important as cleaning up after an oil spill. Our wildlife and the destiny of Cape Hatteras is at stake.

Sincerely,  
David L. Kranz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8074    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:09:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have seen what off-roaders do to forrest land and have heard them comment they "just love to go out and tear it up and get muddy." The scars take decades to heal and it's completely senseless to allow these vehicles on our public lands. Do not tolerate this needless destruction!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8075    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** lomascolo, suzanne m  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8076    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Frymoyer, Allison A

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:09:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8077    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Selwood, Lydia F

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:10:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

As a frequent visitor to Cape Hatteras, I am really and truly alarmed at the idea of "off road vehicles" being permitted on the beaches. The MAIN reason I have taken my family on vacation to this location, is the UNSPOILED beaches, the peace & quiet that is Cape Hatteras. I hope this will not be allowed, as this will totally change the landscape & all the things that make Cape Hatteras such a wonderful vacation destination.

Although I am a resident of Virginia, and Virginia Beach is MUCH closer than Cape Hatteras, the overdevelopment in Virginia Beach makes me bypass VA Beach, and continue on to Cape Hatteras. The over commercialization of VA Beach simply makes it undesirable to anyone who truly seeks to "Get away from it all!"

I have rented many a cottage on the Cape, and enjoyed many vacations since 1981. PLEASE do not make Cape Hatteras just a distant memory for my family & me. Counting the turtles, watching the wildlife, exploring all the natural wonders in this beautiful spot will be adversely affected, and will alter the landscape for the worse.

Please keep in mind, that with the devastation along the Gulf States, the sea turtles -- and other endangered wildlife -- are especially stressed at this time. Is it sound policy to create even more obstacles to their ability to live, reproduce, and continue to grace our oceans? There are plenty of spaces for Off Road Vehicles, that will not wreak havoc on endangered species, wildlife, and vital breeding grounds ...

In addition, I believe these vehicles may also pose a threat to small children. I think it is enough for parents to supervise their children & keep them safe from the water. Adding the possibility of children & adults being run over by a reckless driver (I picture alcohol use as an added problem!) will simply ruin the beaches!

I urge you to leave Cape Hatteras as it is, for generations to come!

**Correspondence ID:** 8078    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

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

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Rebecca Carlson



<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8079	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:10:11						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8080	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:10:17						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	get with the program...SAVE the beaches!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8081	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Swain, John D						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:10:18						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We must protect our fragile lands from human machines!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8082	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Mitchell, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:10:22						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe that off road vehicles should be barred from Cape JHatteras beaches						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8083	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	McMullen, Ann						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:10:27						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8084	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, especially Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers—including my ornithologist girlfriend—and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is</p>						

unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Justin Hayes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8085    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:10:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** ORVs have not place on a National Seashore. You cannot "carefully" monitor their use. Please take a look at the damage down on Big Cypress Preserve in Florida. ORV users have no respect for the environment or anything in it. Do not allow their us on MY land!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8086    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:10:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8087    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:10:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8088    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the

beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. ORV access to areas that serve as a unique habitat for rare birds and threatened and endangered sea turtles seems like an oxymoron to the goal of trying to sustain a positive environment in which these creatures may survive.

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

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

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

ORV access to areas that serve as a unique habitat for rare birds and threatened and endangered sea turtles seems like an oxymoron to the goal of sustaining a positive environment for these creatures.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8089    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:10:54  
**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:** 8090    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:10:54  
**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:** 8091    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:10:54  
**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:** 8092    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:10:54  
**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:** 8093    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:10:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8094    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kochis, Jim  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Allowing off-road vehicle on the beaches will endanger the breeding shorebirds many of which are endangered. It will also endanger sea turtle nesting. I am strongly against allowing off-road vehicles year round.  
Jim K.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8095    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:04  
**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:** 8096    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:04

**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:** 8097    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:04

**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:** 8098    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8099    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:11:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8100    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:11:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8101    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:11:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8102    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:11:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8103    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

THIS WOULD not only protect the wildlife but also protect the visit of the people who visit the area for rest and relaxation, not to hear vehicle noise that is even noisier than at home. Visitors who travel using their own 2 legs far outnumber the visitors who want to use vehicles, and our rights should be protected. The park is there to commune with nature, not noisy vehicles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8104    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07.2010 13:11:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8105    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07.2010 13:11:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8106	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	May.07,2010 13:11:18					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it may concern: Please keep this park free of unnecessary vehicles. The whole idea behind National Parks is to preserve the nature and beauty and quiet as much as is possible for all to enjoy. That is why people visit these parks. I have worked at Yellowstone National Park and Rocky Mountain National Park. These are some of our most valued treasures in our country. Please support the nature and animals and the serenity for people visiting the park. Do what National Parks were intended to do. Keep the wild as wild as possible. Sincerely, Lin Welch					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8107	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.07,2010 13:11:21					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8108	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.07,2010 13:11:21					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8109	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.07,2010 13:11:21					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only					



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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8110    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8111    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8112    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8113    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8114    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8115    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8116    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Laporte, Stephanie L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8117    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I and my family have spent the last 20 summer seasons in Avon, and love the entire Outerbanks area. It has changed greatly since I first went to the islands there 30 years ago, but I still enjoy "getting away" from it all, including noise and traffic. That is why I would like to speak out about ORV use in an area that I love to relax in.

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8118    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8119    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8120    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cawood, Kyle  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8121    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As humans it is our responsibility to nurture or at least do no harm the areas under our care.  
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:** 8122    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8123    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8124    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me, a Virginia resident.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8125    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent,

I worked for NPS for 40 years and my first duty station was Cape Hatteras NS, Wright Brothers NMem and Fort Raleigh NMon. Thank you for the chance to submit comments on the plan for ORV use on the beach. We have vacationed at Cape Hatteras every year for the last ten, sometimes coming down twice a year. We come for the beautiful sandy beaches, clean water, the sun, the wind and the solitude and enjoy walks not only on the beaches but on the salt marsh trails and in the woody areas.

The draft environmental impact statement alternatives give way too much latitude for ORVs. The NPS must re-examine this and balance the many recreational uses as well as protection of the bird, turtles and wild areas that are so much a part of this area's national significance.

Of the 6 alternatives, I can support Alternative D "environmentally preferred" if certain modifications are made in it as follows:

- 1) The National Park Service cannot/must not ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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 use of ORVs in so much of the area, endangers the resources--the birds, the turtles, the isolated beaches and the magnificent solitude!
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. Potentially heavy ORV use is an anathema to 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. It's your job to assert the NPS authority--please don't abdicate any of that responsibility! Thank you for all the hard work that NPS employees continue to do to preserve our national parks, seashores, monuments and memorials for my son and daughter and for future generations. I will be anxious to see the revised ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8126    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8127    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gallagher, Sarah W  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:11:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Our beaches - and this one in particular - is not the proper setting for ATV activities. The peace and enjoyment of the many - not to mention the the survival of wild and plantlife - must come before destructive and polluting play for a few.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8128    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Spiegel, Karen E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:12:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
I am writing to urge the National Park Service to adopt an Off Road Vehicle management plan that preserves the peace and beauty of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, and does not overly favor ORVs. I am concerned about the safety of endangered sea turtles and birds, as well as the ability of human beings to enjoy the seashore without the obnoxious noise and pollution caused by ORVs.  
The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sincerely,  
Karen Spiegel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8129    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,  
Ms. Ottilia A. Wach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8130    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:12:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
 Sincerely, Linda Harrison

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8131    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:12:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My opinion is hat off road vehicles should NOT dominate Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8132    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:12:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8133    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Carlton, Patricia  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:12:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a longtime resident of Washington, D.C., I vacationed in Cape Hatteras and the Outer Banks every summer for over 20 years. It was, and is, one of the last shore areas where one can find peace and quiet while walking on the beach, and where shorebirds and other wildlife can safely breed and live free from human interference. It is a national treasure. The only way to maintain this environment is to strictly and rigorously limit off terrain vehicles. The very concept of a natural preserve is alien to the noise and destruction caused by motor vehicles of any type. People who want to indulge in vehicles can do it in cities or on a specially designated track. Humans do not have to have instant access to every bit of nature and wilderness - those who appreciate it the most will want to protect it, even if that means protecting it from ourselves. As Pogo (comic strip) famously said - "We have met the enemy, and he is us." Thank you for your consideration and efforts to protect our precious natural resources.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8134    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:13:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Just to conclude my previous comment on minimizing ORV use at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I support a modified Alternative D as the preferred plan.  
 Regards,  
 Charlie Pick

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8135    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:13:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8136    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have visited many National Parks and am appalled at the damagae done by off-road vehicles. Seeing tire tracks on the beach would not set well with me.

**Correspondence ID:** 8137    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Silver, C.E.P., Ronald

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8138    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:11

**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:** 8139    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Yerges, John R

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:15



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Off-road vehicles are fun. I had a go-cart as a kid. However, my parents made it clear that it was not to be driven in the gardens, the decorative lawns, or anywhere else that it would cause significant and lasting damage. That is your job now - to decide if and where these things can be driven safely without ruining the landscape or the natural peace and quiet for every living thing in the area. Please consult recognized experts to make decisions based on good science and the welfare of all - not just a handful of off-roading enthusiasts. Off-roading is fun, but it is not a constitutional right - especially in delicate pristine areas. Don't let another special interest group win a destructive perk at the expense of everyone else. Tell them to play only where it doesn't hurt anyone or anything else.

**Correspondence ID:** 8140    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Iverson Bedford, Beverly E

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The ATV cannot coexist with pedestrians seeking the peace found in listening to the wind, the movement of the waves and the sound of bird song. Our very souls long for this and we get so little of it. The animals in our world are stressed to the maximum. Allow them some peace for breeding and caring for their young. They are God's creation. Let them have a few tiny scraps of the earth. The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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:** 8141    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8142    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Breakfield, Sandra

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Recreational vehicles, no matter how small, can be damaging to the ecosystem of beaches. Besides the physical damage to the beaches, the noise factor can be extremely detrimental to wildlife. Let's keep the rec vehicles off Cape Hatteras National Seashore and other seashores like it.

**Correspondence ID:** 8143    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** burley, david m

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

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication

of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8144	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:13:32					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is unfair to subject those of us who do not wish to destroy the tranquility of the National Seashore with the pollution and noise of off road vehicles to their excesses. They have rights, but not when they interfere with my rights to enjoy the same area. There are plenty of places they can go without using and destroying my National Seashore. It belongs to all of us to nurture and protect for future generations not to destroy and annoy.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8145	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:13:33					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Allowing vehicles of any kind on any beach and especially one on the National Register does not make any sense at all. Not only will the vehicles damage the beach areas but also destroy the habitat of small wild animals and birds. In addition, the peace and quiet that is necessary to fully enjoy this wonderful area will be non-existent. Taxpayers funds will be nbecessary to repair the inevitable damages caused by the vehicles. Aren't there enough traffic jammed areas in this country without adding another one along this majestic seashore?					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8146	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Giurleo, Patricia A					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:13:34					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8147	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:13:40					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8148	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:13:40					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.					

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8149    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

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

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

Birds and turtles, these species are fighting for their survival. We are losing species far too quickly. We can never get them back once they are gone. They cannot speak for themselves and so we must in order to make sure they remain in an ecosystem that is so important to us all.

Areas for ORV use can always be put in other areas that do not endanger these precious lives. I would rather have those beautiful beings in this world than give preference to ORV use. I choose their lives over recreational use of the beaches on which they nest!

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8150    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8151    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8152    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:13:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Please help our wildlife and our world.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8153    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
My family and I have been going to this park for decades. Please keep motorized vehicles off the beaches. Keep this place as undisturbed as possible. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Nancy R. Neilsen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8154    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8155    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8156    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8157    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8158    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8159    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8160    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
All work conducted to improve wildlife environments and therefore ours as well is welcomed by people across the political spectrum.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8161    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** DiGirolamo, Paul  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow ORVs on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. They are inevitably destructive to the delicate plant and animal life, and there are already plenty of places to drive on the beach if one wants. Keep these last remaining wild places as pure as as natural as possible please, that is your job and your responsibility to the citizens of this nation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8162    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8163    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8164    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8165    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8166    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
May 7, 2010  
Dear Superintendent Murray,  
The plan proposed by those wishing to preserve the lives of shorebirds and sea turtles is based in scientific research as to the negative effects that would follow if unrestricted beach access is allowed by off road vehicles. This plan allows for use by these vehicles, just with restricted areas to respect nesting sites, natural resources and life. Those who state that this is a total ban on ORV use for 5 months and that it will wipe out their livelihood are, I believe, engaging in scare tactics and falsehoods. It can do just the opposite, by giving fair access for both groups wishes. Further, the statement that they "have a right to go where ever they want" should not give them the right to destroy life...and it would for the foreseeable future... if natural resources and wildlife are not properly protected. As humans, we can have such power over nature, but I don't believe it is our right (God given or otherwise) to use it for our own pleasure or monetary gain at the expense of other creatures (that cannot defend themselves), who have an equal right to be here and live in their intended habitats. Wouldn't it be wonderful if our children, and their children would learn to love and respect nature, including our place in it: responsibly protecting natural resources and wildlife. We need to set that example.



Thank you in advance for your careful consideration of both sides of this issue.  
Laurie Kucharik 408 Colony Woods Dr. Chapel Hill, NC 27517

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8167    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8168    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Silver, Margaret  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8169    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:13:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Regards, Susan Seidelman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8170    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:14:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't let off road vehicles trash this lovely beach. While a student at NCSU I enjoyed trips to the this magnificent shore. ORV operators are into speed, noise, and disruption of natural beauty. I have seen the results of their visitations, legal and often illegal, all over this country. The beauty of nature is no place for these machines of destruction. I encourage you to limit access to ORV to remote, not sensitive, and limited spaces. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8171    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:14:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
These are precious species that cannot be replaced.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8172    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:14:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8173    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:14:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8174    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:14:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8175    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:14:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** After what just happened in the Gulf of Mexico, we must do everything possible to preserve wilderness and beaches. Banning off-shore vehicles is a necessity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8176    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Carse, MaryAnne  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:14:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Also, thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8177    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ranieri, Nancy  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:14:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a 30-year visitor to the Outer Banks, it is imperative to me that everything possible be done to protect the wildlife of this crucial eco-system. Off-road vehicle use must be curtailed and restricted in order to preserve this delicate environment or endangered species will be lost. This is the true mission of the National Park Service. I support your efforts fully so that future generations will be able to enjoy the abundance of wildlife found in this beautiful natural environment. Thank you for the important work that you are doing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8178    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:14:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No ORV's at Hatteras! Bad air quality,habitat disruption,noise pollution--Please

**Correspondence ID:** 8179    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:14:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8180    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kane, Michael  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:14:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not encourage motor vehicle traffic on the outer banks islands of North Carolina. There is simply no need to disrupt the natural beauty and delicate ecosystem of this land with recreational traffic. I have vacationed quite happily on the islands for many years without feeling compelled to go driving on the beach!

**Correspondence ID:** 8181    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cummins, Steve  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
 steve cummins

**Correspondence ID:** 8182    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:14:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8183    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

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

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Keleigh Dietsch

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8184    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Taylor, Ron T  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:15:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8185    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:15:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8186    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Rhoades, Chuck  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:15:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please ban ORV from national beaches!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8187    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,  
Gerald Orcholski

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8188    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:15:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I can understand how we might use quiet electric vehicles for the handicapped to gain access to our parks, there seems no good reason for able bodied people to do anything but walk, bike, or canoe our National Parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8189    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:15:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8190    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:15:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, George McLam

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8191    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:15:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow any off-road vehicles on the beaches. That use destroys wildlife and greatly affects peace and serenity of the area. Vehicles use would be at the expense of human pedestrians as well. The noise and pollution does not belong at any beach!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8192    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 In addition to needing to protect wildlife from ORVs, we need to protect the family and visitor experience. I would never take my family with young children to walk on a beach or seashore where ORVs can come out of nowhere driving by. It would be like standing or sitting in the middle of a road - wouldn't be safe. And what wildlife would we be able to see and hear if there were ORVs nearby? Cape Hatteras would lose my tourist dollars if ORVs were permitted, and that would be a very sad thing, for my family included.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8193    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:15:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 In sum, it is simply not an appropriate use of the beach. Period.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best

examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8194    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Columbia, James  
**Received:** May.07.2010 13:15:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8195    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cike, Carrie  
**Received:** May.07.2010 13:15:59  
**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:** 8196    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Young, Sarah E  
**Received:** May.07.2010 13:16:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow widespread use of off road vehicles on Cape Hatteras Beach. These noisy, polluting vehicles do not need to go everywhere! They damage fragile vegetation and make areas unpleasant for everyone else to use. Also, it seems to me that we should encourage people to use their legs to walk when they are in beautiful natural areas. It is more healthy for them and for the rest of us. Please say no.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8197    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 13:16:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a firm believer that no motorized vehicles be allowed on sensitive habitat: beaches, estuaries, dunes, etc. These areas must be preserved for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8198    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Jackson, Donald L  
**Received:** May.07.2010 13:16:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am well acquainted with the beaches of Cape Hatteras, and have personally witnessed the effects of off-road vehicles on those beaches. I do not believe that allowing ORV's on those beaches is within the spirit or the intent of setting these lands aside as part of the National Park System. Arguments may be made that handicapped people may not be able to move freely on the beaches - but there are other means than large motorized vehicles for providing access to the water's edge. Other than the handicapped issue, there is no rationale that makes sense for other motorized vehicles running on the beaches.  
 Past history of lax regulations that have allowed the practice to become established should not be used as an excuse for continued use. The fact that the first ORV use predated the establishment of the park is also specious. Once an area has been designated with provisions for preserving the natural resources, past uses must be examined for their compatability with the new regimen. ORV use in my estimation is certainly not compatible with preservation of the resource. It is also not conducive to recreational enjoyment by anyone other than those few with ORV's.



There are plenty of other beaches along the East Coast that are open to ORV use. Cape Hatteras should not be one of those areas. A well-organized lobby for the use of off-road vehicles on the beaches of Cape Hatteras should be heard for what it is - a voice for a few users. The majority of use of Cape Hatteras does not involve the use of an ORV, and the fact that the voice for that majority is not as stringent or ever-present at all of the discussions should not sway common sense.

Studies in the 1970's documented the acceleration of downward erosion of beach sand due to each passage of an ORV. Other studies at about the same time documented the effect of ORV travel on ground-nesting shorebirds - from outright destruction of the nests and hatchlings to the disturbance causing a lack of nesting activity.

It is time the ORV issue was settled - not with a reduced or limited use plan, but a total stop to use of mechanized vehicles on the beaches, with perhaps the exception of emergency use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8199    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:16:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8200    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Parsley, Adina  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:17:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8201    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:17:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

0011139

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Emily Goodwin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8202    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:17:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am appalled at the thought that off-road vehicles could be allowed on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Will there be no place left for peace and quiet and undisturbed animal habitats without the interference of machines? National Parks (and Seashores) were established to preserve these magnificent natural resources, not so they could be run over by idiots and their machines. There is absolutely no need, no reason why people should be allowed to drive on this beach. The only reason would be to enrich off-road vehicle companies and satisfy morons who couldn't care less about nature. Let them go to Daytona or some racetrack, not Cape Hatteras.  
Sincerely, Kristi Karls

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8203    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:17:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the outer banks, especially, cape hatteras, free from all the noise from all vehicles. I never really liked seeing any truck or such on the beaches, save for the lifeguards.  
thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8204    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mainelli, Margaret  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:17:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles can be really detrimental to the environment and wild life, not to mention annoying when you are looking for peace and quiet. I ask that no off-road vehicles be allowed on the beaches of Cape Hatteras.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8205    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. I personally vacationed in Corolla just last summer!  
My fear is that this area will suffer the same fate as another coastal area I'm familiar with. Pismo Beach and its dunes in California have become overrun by the spring-breaker types with ORVs. They have no respect for the land, environment or others who would like to enjoy the shared space for its inherent amusement. Additionally, consuming alcohol and partying have led to serious ORV accidents time and time again. Who is going to monitor this behavior if the Cape is opened to such "recreation"? There are numerous alternatives, such as biking, kayaking etc. that provides a thrill while making a smaller impact on the environment or offending others in the surrounding area.  
All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8206    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kantola, Barbara L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:17:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We must take better care of our delicate ecosystem and especially our beaches and areas connected to our oceans and seas and lakes and rivers. We end up drinking this water. These are beautiful places that should be treated with respect, and not trampled on by off-road vehicles. We have only one planet to live on and if we continue to destroy our dear planet Earth, where will we live?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8207    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McDonald, Susan  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:17:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep our beaches free of the damage of man made devices which create air pollution, noise pollution, and usually brings in much extra garbage. If these machines come there will be times we will not be able to hear the wonderful sounds of the waves lapping up the beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8208    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Albanese, LaDonna  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:17:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8209    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Dorsey, Mike

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:17:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** ATVs should have their own area. My wife and I do not pay our taxes so that this particular group can drive around my Parks. The mission of the Park is to preserve these areas as the are for future generations. There use will definitely have an impact a very severe impact.

If it is decide to let them in our natural parks, perhaps they should be allow to drive up the Lincoln Monument, or Gettysburg Battle field.

Let them drive their ATVs to the park, and leave them in the parking lot for motorized vehicles.

Please either set aside areas outside special ATV Parks for these people that can be sacrificed and keep them outside our Parks.

Thanks you

**Correspondence ID:** 8210    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:18:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** ORVs in NPS is a bad idea, you should know better.

**Correspondence ID:** 8211    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:18:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Hatteras sands are beaches not highways. ORV's cause habitat degradation through noise and air pollution. They also scare off many shorebird and seabird species, e.g. terns. Most unfortunately, ORV use as proposed would "urbanize" beaches that should remain refuges for the human spirit not seaside Nascar playgrounds. PLEASE DON'T ALLOW ORV's TO POLLUTE HATTERAS BEACHES!

**Correspondence ID:** 8212    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Hameick, Kendall H

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Supertindent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Kendall Hamrick

**Correspondence ID:** 8213    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Vaydik, Frank W

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:18:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** ORV's, and I am the owner of one, should not be allowed access to more than 1/3 of the beach. the solitude of the beach is an important factor to beach goers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8214    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:19:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 5-07-10  
Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Ms. J. Biby \*\*\*\*\*

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8215    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:19:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow more access to ATVs on our National Seashores..these machines are obnoxious, polluting, noisy and the antithesis of what shore preservation means. why should motorheads get to rule EVERYTHING!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8216    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** WILBUR, DAVID  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:19:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** > There is a place for OVR's. It's not on our scenic beaches and coastline. There is wildlife habitat to consider, which continues to be affected by indiscriminate use of our lands. For the sake of our natural environment, please keep the ORV's off of the beach. Thank you. DHW

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8217    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
I live near the Oceano Dunes in California. The dunes are the only off-road beach in the state, and I can say from personal experience that off-road use there is detrimental to our local ecosystem and public health.  
A multi-year scientific study recently concluded that off-road use of the dunes was directly responsible for elevated levels of particulate matter and pollution in the Nipomo Mesa, a residential area downwind (usually) of the dunes. Elevated levels of pollution contribute to a number of health problems, of course. I find it completely irresponsible for one group of people (off-road enthusiasts) to participate in an activity that directly harms the health of another group of people. For the National Parks Service to consider making such a situation possible in a new area is even worse. I urge you to live up to the spirit of your organization and help preserve nature for ALL of us to enjoy, not destroy it (and create ridiculous pollution in the process).  
Following are many well-formulated points, with which I wholeheartedly agree, from the NPCA:  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8218    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:19:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8219      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Fearey, Patricia

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:19:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please help us not to pave over the entire planet!

**Correspondence ID:** 8220      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Heikkila, Nicholas E

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:19:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Thank you, Nicholas Heikkila

**Correspondence ID:** 8221      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Whitehouse, Judy K

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:19:59

**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:** 8222      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Wittman, Charles

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:20:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree with NPCA in seeking an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.  
 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:** 8223    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:20:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a citizen and voter, I am very thankful to have lived on a shoreline one coast or the other. unfortunately, I have personally witnessed many an environmental tragedy, that resulted from beach erosion. most times, in the name of recreation, real estate expansion, or bad judgements made on the part of elected officials, many a beach front has suffered cataclysmic destruction. please take the initiative and help prevent such damage from occurring on a piece of national shore front such as exists in North Carolina. fishing, beach going & other recreational sports associated with the North Carolina are endanger if the current proposal is allowed to go forward. I urge you to please stop any action that would result in the destruction of the most beautiful treasures this country has. thank you for listening.

**Correspondence ID:** 8224    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Waltasti, Marilyn A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
 \*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
 Sincerely, Marilyn A. Waltasti

**Correspondence ID:** 8225    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:20:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
 Thank you, Martin Lupowitz, D.C.

**Correspondence ID:** 8226    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:20:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement

0011144

privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Suzanne Black

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8227    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:20:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8228    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:20:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 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 need an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds. 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. Thank you Karen Orchard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8229    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** magdanz, susan  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:20:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8230    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:21:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sincerely, Sara Ross

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8231    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:21:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family is visiting Cape Hattaras in August. We want to see pristine beaches without the abomnible sounds of ATVs.Please don't allow them!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8232    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Send Your Comments Today!  
DEADLINE TUESDAY!!  
(The link above will take you to the National Park Service's Planning, Environment, and Public Comment Site) Dear Dolores,  
**URGENT: 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 advocates--like you--fail to take action, Cape Hatteras National Seashore will be dominated by ORV use for the next 20 years!  
NPCA seeks an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.  
Take Action Now: Submit your comments to the NPS by midnight (Mountain Time), Tuesday, May 11, and urge them 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.  
Here's how to submit your comments to the Park Service:  
1) To comment, please click here. This link will take you to the National Park Service's Planning, Environment, and Public Comment Site. The page you will see displayed is the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS comment page.  
2) After filling in your personal information, simply cut and paste the sample letter below into the NPS comment form; we highly encourage you to add your own comments as well.  
3) After completing the comment form, make sure to click the "Submit" button found at the bottom of the page.  
\*\*\*\*\* Sample Letter  
Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8233    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:21:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with



its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8234	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:21:16						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Gentlemen, I love the Cape. I love the wildlife, the shore,the quiet of the place. Please don't let it be taken over by ORV's. It's a very fragile ecosystem. There should be no cars, go carts or ORVs on the beach at any time. Why would anyone who cared about the ecosystem there run over it with an ORV? Please help those of us who care about it preserve it. Thank you, A.Davis, Virginia						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8235	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Lohn-Tinker, Vivian L						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:21:21						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This is no place for off road vehicles.I have been to so many parks that are now ruined because of it. For both the peace of nature and humans.Humans already have many choice to make their racquet and disturb nature. Let it be as it is. Because once it's ruined it is forever. Our land is getting gobbled up by developers and the parks are just a few place that both wildlife and humans can go for peace and quiet.Let's leave this wonderful place as is. A place for families to go and be in touch with nature. A place to get away from the noise,pollution and rat race of daily living.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8236	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Bibuld, Jerome						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:21:29						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	U. S. invaders out of Afghanistan, Colombia, Cuba, Germany, Guatemala, Guam, Iraq, Haiti, Japan, Khyrgistan, Korea, Pakistan and Puerto Rico, among more than a thousand "bases"! Hands off Iran! Fight terrorism! Disarm the Pentagon and dissolve the CIA!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8237	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Gillingham, Carol						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:21:54						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8238	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:22:16						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have visited Cape Hatteras National Seashore numerous times over my 64 years. Permitting off- road vehicles would spoil the experience for pedestrian visitors and possibly endanger people with "show-off" riders not paying attention to the pedestrians, both walking and seated in spots where they would not be visible immediately to the riders. Further, noise and gasoline fumes would detract from the opportunity to be enveloped in nature without disturbance.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8239	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		

**Name:** Downs, Virginia L  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:22:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off-road vehicles OFF Cape Hatteras. The noise, pollution, and destruction they cause are the death of plants and animals, and render any area ugly and unusable by people. Besides this, many children are killed by off-road vehicles every year. Please protect the public welfare, and do not allow this kind of misuse of a natural resource. Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 8240    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Vallery, Anne  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:22:20  
**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:** 8241    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bolton, Jessica L  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:22:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been traveling to the Hattaras shores my entire life. Currently my family owns a rental property on the sound. We have always respected the beaches and the natural habitat that it has to offer. One of the main reasons of visiting these beaches is the access to the beach and able to bring family pets to enjoy the activities the beach has to offer. In the past years it has been great to see the community grow but still keep the peaceful nature to the area. I would hate to see this decline and the local families who strive for the summer vacationers be depleted. I understand the want and need to respect mother nature, but I feel as though there are other ways of handling this where everyone can win. I hope this act is not passed or if it is than there is a happy medium that is met.  
Thank you, Lauren

**Correspondence ID:** 8242    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:22:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras MUST be kept pristine...for wildlife and for scenic purposes. Allowing ATV usage would devastate the beach and area, especially for wildlife. Violent weather patterns do enough damage to the beach area, we as humans do not need to add to it. Thank you for allowing my comments. Even though I live in Nebraska, I would like to know that Cape Hatteras is safe from human damage via ATV usage! Lisa Hoffman

**Correspondence ID:** 8243    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources or the visitor experience of primitive wilderness. Visiting a wilderness area only to hear ORVs and to see the damage they can cause, is very discouraging, and no longer a wilderness experience.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8244    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:22:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Just because someone purchases an ORV does not in any obligate any public agency to accommodate ORV owners by opening up public lands which can be enjoyed by everyone on foot. No one is denying anyone access, but motorized or mechanized access, which is known to be extremely destructive, must NOT be allowed in ANY of our public lands. When non-invasive or passive recreation visitors are exploring and experiencing our national natural resources, their experiences are diminished, if not destroyed, by the presence, annoyance, and destruction of/from ORV's. Any management plan must ban ORV's and all other mechanized and motorized machines or vehicles from our national lands. At the very least, we urge the adoption of modified Alternative D of the DEIS. The National Park Service must adhere to its mission and protect and preserve our nation's natural resources. Thank you for considering our views.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8245    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mon, Luis  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:22:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Don't we have enough environmental damage to our natural resources already?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8246    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:22:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8247    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:22:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Cordially,  
Emma Onawa

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8248    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." In fact, it is questionable if allowing any ORV use will leave the resource unimpaired.
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources, and without disturbing the pedestrian visitor experience through noise or other forms of pollution.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8249    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:23:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** ORVs are destructive and polluting. They allow their users to fling their empty beer cans further out into supposedly protected areas. It is stupid to have invaluable habitats destroyed for the pleasure of a few who, often, have no appreciation or knowledge of what they are destroying.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8250    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:23:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8251    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hawkins, Adaire A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Adaire Hawkins

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8252    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:23:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We, as Americans, cannot ruin the natural and pristine wonders our glorious nation has to offer us. And if Off Road Vehicles are allowed to tread upon such environments, then we have failed to keep America the beautiful as it has been.

The citizens must band together and protect all that is natural and wonderous to our country. Do not ruin the beach. For if we ruin it, there will be no restoring it to it's once grand splendor.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8253    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Perdios, Dan R  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:23:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sincerely,  
Dan Perdios

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8254    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Greater mephasis must be placed on pedestrian access and wildlife management. ORV use is often destructive of natural habitat and disruptive to all non-ORV users of a natural area, including wildlife and people enjoying the natural sounds of the ecosystem.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Becky Erickson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8255    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:23:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best

examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8256	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Kraemer, Honora					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:23:34					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I'm writing as a citizen of the United States and as a person who strives, on a daily basis, to find pieces of our great nature that have been protected and are pristine and where there is peace and quiet and the vision of the landscape and it's beauty. As members of the human race we need places to go to rejuvenate and grow ourselves, away from our vehicles, our cell phones, our machinations. I do not see how opening the parks to ORVs is beneficial to the environment, to habitats, nor to us as humans. Thank you for your consideration					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8257	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:23:35					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Off-road vehicals don't belong in wildlife habitat that is easily damaged/destroyed/disturbed for the indiginous wildlife already on the brink/endangered list. Instead researve these areas to be set aside for animal habitat and put limits on human intrusions- how many visiter can enter these wildlife zones,the time frame around mating seasons- a careful study can done on this subject by park staff annually to monitor animal activity in the reserve and human impact in reserve areas.Some ideas on funding include entry fees,public funds raised for set-aside areas, funds earmarked for set-sides, state/federal funds for park staff and services and better funding for environmental studies/Earth Sciences and Ecology would be good step in the right direction in this debate. For now let's keep ORV's off the shoreline and leave it to wildlife and the occasi onl hiker.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8258	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Slote, Karen					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:23:45					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8259	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:23:54					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8260	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:23:57					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep Cape Hatteras National Seashore in its pristine shape. Off road vehicles have totally destroyed Pismo Beach in California. Don't let this happen to your beach!! Bennye Cardin					

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8261    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:24:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please! No off road vehicles on your lovely beaches! I can assure you, this tourist and her family will look for another vacation area if you go that route. I doubt if I am the only one with similar feelings about this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8262    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gloege, Randall G  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:24:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** When public lands and opportunities for solitude and contemplation are so few and far between, it is important that we continue to make recommendations in the public interest rather than succumb to the continuous demands of corporate interests and motor heads. I am writing as a citizen of Montana where there still exists the myth that we have a super abundance of wilderness and ready opportunities for solitude and quiet. In fact both of these are in increasingly short supply.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8263    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sadiki, Chala  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:24:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow access to off-road vehicles in Cape Hatteras National Seashore. My mother and her good friend Ila Loetcher (the Turtle Lady of South Padre Island Texas) were instrumental in working with endangered sea turtles in their turtle nesting project many years ago so we know the dangers of ORV on beaches. The dangers to wildlife including the endangered Ridley Sea Turtle are devastating and often deadly - the tiny hatchlings have enough to contend with without being crushed by these behemoth vehicles against which they have no chance. My family and I have not been to Cape Hatteras in many years - if this ORV access happens we are very unlikely to go again. Thanks you for your consideration of my comments. Chala Sadiki

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8264    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Otzel, Margaret  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:24:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern: Please do not allow motorized vehicles on our shorelines! Having them on the beaches only add to air and noise pollutions. Our shores are a national treasure--please don't take that away from us! Sincerely, Margaret Otzel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8265    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:24:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8266    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** brown, john c  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:24:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The beaches of America should belong to the people of America, not to special interest groups. And certainly not special interest groups which render the beaches totally unpleasant for everyone else.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8267    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Dominguez, Laura  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:24:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8268    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a visitor of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished and far too precious to be subject to the interference and damage that ORV's will cause.

All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant.

Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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 read my concerns. Please protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and human generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Katherine E. Gibson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8269    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:24:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8270    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it



depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. I appreciate that the ORV's are enjoyed by many kids and adults alike, but there has to be a limit as they are way too invasive in sound and damage done so please contain their use intelligently.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Idee Mallardi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8271    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:25:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8272    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Stark, Richard  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:25:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There are plenty of areas throughout the country that allow off-road vehicle use. There is no reason why a national park should be included as one of these areas. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8273    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Send Your Comments Today!  
DEADLINE TUESDAY!!

(The link above will take you to the National Park Service's Planning, Environment, and Public Comment Site) Dear Marjorie,  
URGENT: 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 advocates--like you--fail to take action, Cape Hatteras National Seashore will be dominated by ORV use for the next 20 years!

NPCA seeks an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.

Take Action Now: Submit your comments to the NPS by midnight (Mountain Time), Tuesday, May 11, and urge them 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.

Here's how to submit your comments to the Park Service:

- 1) To comment, please click here. This link will take you to the National Park Service's Planning, Environment, and Public Comment Site. The page you will see displayed is the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS comment page.
- 2) After filling in your personal information, simply cut and paste the sample letter below into the NPS comment form; we highly encourage you to add your own comments as well.
- 3) After completing the comment form, make sure to click the "Submit" button found at the bottom of the page.

\*\*\*\*\* Sample Letter

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Marjorie Winkler

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8274    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:25:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Our National Parks and Seashores are meant to preserve and protect the last 0.1% of our country's natural heritage for future generations. How anyone managing these resources can even think of opening it up to ORV use is beyond me. The directive should be to reduce human impacts on these areas NOT increase them! While were at it let's put in a Water Park in Yosemite! Encouraging ORV use at Hatteras or any other National Park is a dumb idea. Anyone working in our parks system even considering such a move should be fired.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8275    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:25:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Insure the integrity of the beaches and wildlife. Studies show that allowing off road vehicles into sensitive surroundings seriously effects the environment and wildlife - just say NO. Enough destruction of natural surrounds occurs, there must be limitations or nothing will be left of natural areas and accompanying wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8276    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gilman, Cynthia  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:25:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a person who often vacations at Cape Hatteras because of it's great natural and (so-far) unspoiled beauty, I see NO REASON TO ALLOW OFF ROAD VEHICLES in this area to endanger what is a natural treasure. PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS TO HAPPEN ! PLease safegaurd the beauty of the land in your care so that generations after can appreciate it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8277    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Navarro, Greg  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:25:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a uniquely beautiful place for humans and fish and wildlife. It is our obligation to keep it they way nature created it for us to enjoy and come back to with future generations. The fish and wildlife also depend on its natural setting to survive and prosper.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8278    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Witmer, John D  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:25:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8279    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Vinz, Michele  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Michele Vinz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8280    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I wish to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I am a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a Concerned and dedicated supporter of national parks. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must 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 hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sandra Seth

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8281    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:25:59  
**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:** 8282    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:26:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** These monster-toys are among the most destructive to our wildlife and the environment. It is not a challenge to understand that they must be outlawed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8283    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lohn-Tinker, Vivian L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:26:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8284    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:26:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

One final note. With the recent oil catastrophe in the Gulf of Mexico, your organization should be planning ahead for potential impacts to the Hatteras shoreline. Wildlife may need special care that will not include ORV recreation, don't you agree?

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8285    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Frank, Randall  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

Thank you for hearing comments from UX citizens as far away as California. As a frequent tourist and nature lover who visits this region often I have the highest hopes that protection of the animals and habitat will prevail over the interests of off road vehicle users. These remaining lands are too precious to compromise over. The compromises have been made; what remains in some pristine state is our duty to conserve and protect. Please do all you can to ensure this.

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,

Randall Frank 188 Oak Springs Dr. San Anselmo, CA 94960

**Correspondence ID:** 8286    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:27:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't destroy Cape Hatteras, respect nature and especially wildlife.

**Correspondence ID:** 8287    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:27:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Bill Haegele New Windsor, Maryland

**Correspondence ID:** 8288    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:27:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I don't understand how such a proposal could be even considered. The place we are discussing is a fragile ecological treasure. Let the off-roaders get their butts off their noisy pollution-spewing machines, walk the area and try to learn how to appreciate that which they seek to destroy. No, no...NO on this proposal!

**Correspondence ID:** 8289    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Logue, Lawrence S  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:27:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to see the Park Service devise a plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds. Thank for your time and service. Lawrence S. Logue

**Correspondence ID:** 8290    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:27:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8291    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:27:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement

privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8292    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:27:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore

Please keep this beautiful area clear of off road vehicles!

These vehicles make too much noise, can be dangerous for other visitors, and JUST DON'T BELONG on this seashore! I believe people's right to peace and quiet needs to supersede NOISY OFV'S!

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

**Correspondence ID:** 8293    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:27:59

**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:** 8294    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:28:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8295    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

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

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:28:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** OHV use on beaches is inappropriate for a national treasure.

**Correspondence ID:** 8296    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:28:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sincerely, Sue Pierson

**Correspondence ID:** 8297    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bloomer, Jerry  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:28:39  
**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:** 8298    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:28:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree that nesting animals should be protected however the buffers you are proposing are far too excessive. Seven hundred and seventy one acres per brood has the potential to destroy Hatteras Island's economy. Would it be possible to construct other man-made dredge islands like the Cora June Island?  
As the owner of a rental home for twenty years in Avon, I am very concerned that people will not continue to rent homes since there is a possibility that they would not be able to use the beach during their stay. We have noticed a decrease in rent since May 2008. If rentals continue to decrease, we too could be in jeopardy of loosing our house.  
Not having access to the beach will change the entire way of life on Hatteras Island, destroy the economy and businesses.  
Thank you for your time.  
Connie Stover

**Correspondence ID:** 8299    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** steinbach, susan l  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:28:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Motorized vehicles are NOISEY give off pollution and disturb the animals and take away the calm and peace of nature If you would like to enjoy nature at its best get a walking stick and go for a walk. If you are not able to walk motorize yourself minimally with the least impact on the natural world and go enjoy.

**Correspondence ID:** 8300    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:28:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** RVs do not belong in public parks, beaches or other natural places - it affects the wildlife, causes noise pollution which affects natural migration and wildlife habit.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8301	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:29:02						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I agree with the NPS not allowing ORVS and pedestrian traffic on NPS land to protect wildlife that is endangered. The ORVS are especially damaging to wildlife.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8302	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:29:05						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a former resident of North Carolina, member of the National Parks Conservation Association and ardent supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kate Karriker-Jaffe</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8303	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:29:19						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8304	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Whetstone, Tony						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:29:20						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is wrong to let people drive on the beach so much--please re-write the plan to curtail the use of offroad vehicles on such a fragile environment. Not only does it ruin the experience for pedestrians but it endangers sea turtles and shorebirds.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8305	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Wieland, Loren						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:29:23						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't let these adrenaline addicted fools ruin another beautiful place.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8306	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Fischer, Kristin						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:29:24						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with</p>						



its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8307    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:29:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** ORV should be banned from all beaches! The only use should be used for cleanup or emergencies.  
 What a perfect way to destroy the beach for fowl & fauna & everyone else, so some fat assed jerk can pretend he/she is having a GREAT time??  
 We have enough oil on our beaches w/o the ORVs!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8308    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
 I often go to the Atlantic, Pacific and the Gulf of Mexico (although the visit to the GOM is in doubt this year) and I cannot see any reason , other than someone's desire to destroy beauty, for allowing "idiots with wheels' access to the Cape's natural gifts. There are enough 'natural' dangers to fragile ecosystems without adding the destructive efforts of mankind.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8309    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** garwood, willard s  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:29:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras is a great area. Please do not let it be spoiled.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8310    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely, Helen L. Drwinga, Ph.D.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8311    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:29:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been visiting the outer banks, particularly Hatteras Island for the last 22 years since I was in graduate school at UNC. Having access to the beach and sound is something that needs to be continued. I believe any restrictions would be unfortunate and would greatly hinder the public's ability to enjoy this incredible natural resource.  
Sincerely,  
Michael J. Margolis, DDS, PhD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8312    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:30:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please maintain or tighten protections for beaches from off-road vehicles.  
While an occasional instance of a vehicle on a beach may be necessary (for official purposes) the various creatures who depend on beaches for habitat, nurseries and their overall livelihood, need our responsible and thoughtful protection.  
The North Carolina coast is home to numerous birds, turtles and various types of aquatic life....please keep off-road vehicles away from this fragile and essential habitat.  
Best regards,  
Catherine Decker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8313    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:30:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8314    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
My husband and I have seen the beaches all along the west coast of the USA, especially in Oregon, which have been ruined by ORVs. Unfortunately it seems that most ORV users only want to tear up the environment and destroy wilderness, not only with the tracks they leave, but with noise, air pollution, and trash.  
We live in the Sierra Nevada mountains and have seen beautiful natural springs and streams completely destroyed by ORVs. In addition there have been wildland fires caused by these morons who would not put spark arresters on their vehicles.  
In Utah ORVs have demonstrated time and time again that they refuse to stay on designated "roads" and trails and have left tracks which will still be

visible in 100 years across fragile cryptogamic soils. In Southern California the ORVs have completely denuded the terrain along Hwy 395 which was Joshua tree country.

We have traveled extensively throughout the USA and Canada to camp and hike. We are saddened at how much environmental destruction is caused by ORVs everywhere we go. The national, state, and provincial parks are the only places that can prohibit ORVs. Please protect the Cape Hatteras beaches from ORV destruction.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8315    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,  
Chris  
PS Also, I hate dodging 2000 pound cars on foot.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8316    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** welde, logan  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:30:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Don't allow vehicles to destroy this haven for wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8317    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:30:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the beaches of Hatteras pristine and quiet.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8318    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:31:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow Off Road Vehicles on the beach. When I go the beach I do not want to see tire tracks. I want to appreciate the solitude of the waves and wildlife.  
Sincerely, Joanna Busch

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8319    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:31:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8320    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:31:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family and friends come to Hatteras Island several times a year because of the opportunities it provides for beach access, fishing and water sports, such as kiteboarding, kayaking, etc.  
I own property in Waves, NC.  
If going to the beach, fishing and water sports are restricted on Hatteras Island we will have no reason to return. Our property will become worthless and local businesses will go out-of-business.  
The opinions of the "experts" are just opinions. No one can guarantee that conservation plans will work to save any species. There are many examples of misrepresentation of the facts. For example, claiming a species is on an endangered list when it is not endangered.  
I feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as required.  
I do not support the closing of the beaches on Hatteras Island. Plans D, E & F would basically put the entire island out of business, which would have a huge ripple effect as the island real estate industry will fail. This could have a major impact on our national and state economies.  
I believe that the majority should rule and I support keeping our beaches open to ORV, fishing and water sports.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8321    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kunkel, Ted  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:31:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
In short, I believe in keeping the Seashore just that, a seashore - not an ORV park. ORV drivers have plenty of areas to pursue "petroleum-based recreation," certainly in areas that are less fragile.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8322    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:31:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Thanks, Jill Timm

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8323    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Berman, Rebecca L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:32:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
I believe that the national parks should play a critical role in protecting our wilderness areas. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association, 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 with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North

Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,

Rebecca L. H. Berman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8324    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:32:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** After recently visiting Long Beach in Washington state and encountering the ORV traffic there I would strongly urge you to adopt Plan D. It will protect the ecological values as well as the pedestrian opportunities. The ORV traffic at Long Beach was a surprise and not well monitored. Thank you for accepting my comments. Sincerely, Mary Lohuis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8325    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:32:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8326    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:32:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8327    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:32:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow the ORVs to use this shoreline area all year round. Please limit their use, so that their noise and other pollution does not bespoil this lovely area.

**Correspondence ID:** 8328    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Johnson, Baylor L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:32:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8329    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:32:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madame,

I believe the beauty and essential reason people visit parks and other protected wilderness areas is to connect with Nature. We all need to get away from the noise of regular life, away from cars, trucks, buses & trains. Allowing off road vehicles onto beaches and into forests in against the very nature of the places we are talking about. I think other venues should be designated for motorized vehicles. Tracks for speed and agility, which is what the drivers really want, should be considered. Then there can be safety measures also in place for all those inevitable accidents.  
Thank you for considering my comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 8330    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:32:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please strictly limit the access of motorized vehicular traffic, of all types - there are plenty of tracks for people to drive around in circles, wasting fuel and time, there are few beaches and wild areas free of the noise and pollution these vehicles bring with them. Access to our wild places should be free to all, with due respect paid to the animals and plants which create these glorious spaces. Unfortunately, off-road vehicles are often disrespectful of the place itself, of the other people visiting the space, and of trail and time restrictions established to protect the area.

I have environmental allergies, which are seriously increased by vehicular traffic. Those allergies have also created a hearing issue, which means that I can't hear my neighbor over the traffic noises. I would like to have spaces I can visit, where I can walk and converse without hazard or physical detriment. Unfortunately, there are fewer and fewer of these places.  
In addition, as we watch the gulf coast oil spill nightmare, does it really make a great deal of sense to open up more places for people to waste fossil fuel? As we consider the increasing health hazard of obesity in America, do we really need more places we can ride around and become less fit?  
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this issue. Sincerely, Jean Wright

**Correspondence ID:** 8331    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:32:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
  - 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
  - 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
- Sincerely

Magdalena Hoersch

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8332	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:32:56						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."</p> <p>Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>Sincerely, Cynthia Schlaepfer-Youker</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8333	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:33:06						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Beaches were made for walking, basking, and resting – not as venues for off-road vehicles. They belong to all time, not just to those who can enjoy recreational areas (in the original, root-value sense) only by riding roughshod over them, often damaging them beyond recognition and making them unfit for any other purpose. Nor is this just an unreasonable nightmare. Countless formerly pristine areas throughout our western states are now grievously scarred and rutted from repeated use by wheeled vehicles, to their lasting detriment and the loss of much habitat for native plants and animals. Such misuse could cause unthinkable destruction to these beaches. It must not be allowed to happen.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8334	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Rogers, Jennifer						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:33:06						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	please do not let off road vehicles dominate cape hatteras						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8335	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:33:16						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."</p> <p>Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8336	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:33:28						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D,</p>						

if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8337    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:33:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Submitted as a lover of the Carolina coasts.  
Sincerely,  
Mary Wood-Constable

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8338    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Caudill, Gil  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:34:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Such a dynamic ecosystem can't tolerate ORV traffic.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8339    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:34:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Our National Seashore must be protected from ATVs for the protection of wildlife, sea turtles who nest in the dunes. The seashore should be a place where one can enjoy the natural sounds of the beach, breaking waves, seagulls overhead, not the sounds and smells of vehicle emissions.  
Thank you for these considerations as you weigh opening our National Seashore to ATVs.  
Diana Blank

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8340    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:34:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect the rare sea birds and turtles. If we can't protect these rare species in a National Park, where are we going to be able to? The Gulf of Mexico's wildlife is about to be destroyed by a huge oil slick. Let's do everything we can to balance out that incredible tragedy for nature. Please stop the unregulated off-road-vehicle use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8341    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:35:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** ORV's are a threat and a menace both to wildlife and to the rest of us citizens who might like to visit the Outer Banks by hiking, organized tours in suitable vehicles provided by the Park Service on a ticketed basis. Don't spoil the Outer Banks by ORV's creating visual and environmental issues similar to the Grand Canyon where aircraft/choppers disrupt the silence of the Canyon Park. These Parks are the property of all the people, not just the people with noisy off-road vehicles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8342    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:35:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family of 6 camped in the Hatteras Seashore National Park Campgrounds over Easter week of last year. My children are ages 6, 4, 4, and 2, and the



0011170

6 year old has special needs (Down syndrome). We found that spending the day on the beaches near the campgrounds was HIGHLY DANGEROUS with ORVs zipping by on the sand. My husband and I were TERRIFIED that our children, especially our child with special needs would be hit by an ORV. The danger was very real. Many of the on/off ramps for the vehicles are located near the pathways for walkers. We discovered that the ORVs often needed to gun their engines and floor their gas pedals in order to make it through the soft sands of the dunes. This meant that small children walking to or from the walking paths were OFTEN crossing in front of speeding ORVs. It was a dreadful and scary situation for a young family.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8343    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:35:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8344    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, Xander  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:35:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8345    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:35:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** off road vehicles damage delicate eco systems!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8346    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely, Chris Norbury

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8347      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Carson, David E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:36:17  
**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.  
Sincerely, David Carson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8348      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Schipper, Jane S  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a frequent visitor to Cape Hatteras, a member of the National Parks Conservation Association, and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely, Jane S Schipper

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8349      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:36:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I grew up picnicking on the grass in the Tidal Basin area of Washington D. C. We regularly climbed the very famous Cherry trees and sat high in their branches eating our desserts, while our parents played softball on lawn. It was entirely allowed. But.....that was then. There were far fewer people utilizing the areas and there was not yet the mind set of protecting these treasures.  
I know many of the individuals who have for decades driven their vehicles onto the beach for fishing. They are deeply attached and dedicated to this practice and very much see themselves as guardians of the Hatteras. But.....it is simply not sustainable. Biological and natural systems don't operate on human emotions. They just deteriorate and cease to function with abuse. It is too bad that these people can not continue their own favored form of recreation, but they are adults and can buck up to face reality. Too much is just too much!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8350      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:36:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please help preserve these natural resources.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8351	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:36:43						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a professional archaeologist, student of natural history, and amateur birder, I urge the National Park Service to protect the rare birds and sea turtles for which Cape Hatteras is famous and to ensure equal access for people who choose to visit the Seashore on foot. In 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.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8352	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Croft, Dianne G						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:36:47						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We have so very little natural beauty left. Let's not trash what is yet unspoiled. The people who ruin the environment don't give a damn except for their own selfish pleasure. Please care.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8353	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Pedestrian impact causes enough deterioration on the natural resource without ORV traffic adding an excessive amount of destruction. ***** 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, Stacey Streett						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8354	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Worster, Beverley J						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:36:52						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have seen and heard off-road-vehicles, bunches of them, kids 8-13-yrs-old, just wanting to have fun. Someone could make a living, providing this sort of sport for kids; I'm not judging what kids want to do. I rode a "go-cart" when a kid and loved it. But it was not allowed on public roads or in the city park. I rode it in my own back yard and on the long driveway to our house from the public road. Our public beaches should not be turned into a free-for-all for this sort of traffic. We go to the beach for the sand, the water, the quiet, the sun. Why use the beach for an activity that requires nothing but SPACE and destroys many of the reasons others enjoy its unique qualities? The noise from a bunch of ORV's can be heard at least 1/2 mile away, blocking out the sounds of water lapping, birds calling, wind blowing, all the things MOST PEOPLE want and expect at the beach. It would create conflicts, no matter where it might be "restricted," between the normal beach-goers and the drivers of ORV's. Please, be sensible, DO NOT ALLOW ORV'S ON OUR PUBLIC BEACHES. This is a sport, or maybe a business, if someone chooses to establish it. If we don't allow our public beaches to be used for golf courses, archery ranges, football fields--other sports, or a string of fast food outlets (businesses), why should we turn them into racing tracks (sport business) for noisy mini-cars? The only reason for your considering this is because someone who sells or rents ORV's has put some pressure on you to do it. Please say "NO." This is not a beach activity like sand castles or tossing a beach ball. Unfortunately, much of the advertising for ORV's and cars and trucks, pictures these vehicles driving on a beach (and, no doubt, in many other places where it is generally illegal to do so) leading viewers to naively believe they have some "right" to drive in those places. Wish you could change that expectation, also. It might eliminate the need for comments like this in the future. Thank you for considering my views. Beverley Worster						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8355	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Weathers, Mary B						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:36:52						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	National Parks are for preserving nature, not theme parks for ORV use. Our natural areas are being eaten up by development and commercial use. IT is the responsibility of the National Park system to preserve the best natural lands for perpetual enjoyment of nature. Please, leave this area natural. Once ORV use is in, it spoils the natural quiet and beauty for everyone else. Hikers, birders, and others who enjoy nature will be turned off.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8356	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		

**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07.2010 13:37:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8357    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

**Correspondence ID:** 8358    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Snyder, Sheri D  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

I have to agree with the Congress on this one--When I go to natural settings I always look for the places where primitive wilderness has been preserved. There are plenty of other places where recreational vehicles can go without environmental disruption--including parts of Cape Hatteras itself.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8359    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07.2010 13:37:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have lost the presence of wildlife on our own property due to our neighbors who blast through the woods with ATVS. These pleasure vehicles are loud and disruptive - and strip us of our pleasures. Foxes no longer inhabit the property and the wild turkey are gone. For my husband and me, this is heartbreaking, as communing with nature and viewing the amazing range of wildlife in our once peaceful neighborhood brought much joy. These vehicles also pollute, so instead of the smell of spring blossoms, we get fumes and gasoline. Disgusting. Please, keep pristine lands pristine and peaceful. Thank you!

**Correspondence ID:** 8360    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

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

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:37:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Best regards, Kareem

PS... we've seen what oil and gas fuels do to our beaches in the Gulf of Mexico, let's not allow oil and gas vehicles do even more damage.

**Correspondence ID:** 8361    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:37:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Why do you have to damage things to have fun? Ease up on the 4-wheelin'

**Correspondence ID:** 8362    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:37:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep off road vehicles off the Cape Hatteras National Seashore roads/trails.

**Correspondence ID:** 8363    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:38:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8364    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:38:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Our National Parks need to be kept in as pristine condition as possible so we and our future generations can enjoy their natural beauty and tranquility. Off Road vehicles cause noise pollution, air pollution, kill wildlife, disturb nesting, damage sand dunes and grasses which causes erosion. They can cause ruts that become barriers between sand dunes and grasses and the water. ORV access to the Cape Hatteras beaches should be severely restricted to prevent overuse and abuse.

Thank you for your support of our National Parks which are truly great national assets.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8365	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:38:31						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	In sharing the beach, please consider that to the wildlife this area is not only their recreation area, but their home. Recreation means to recreate, why not recreate a viable habitat for human and wildlife in proportion their needs. When it comes to fun that not only can degrade the area, is noisy and polluting, it also interferes with other beach goers. Please maintain a smaller area for ORV users.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8366	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Heinemann, Heinz J						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:38:34						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have visited Cape Hatteras several times over the years. I have always been impressed by its pristine beauty. I think it a crying shame to allow off road vehicles on the beaches. They may be right for some National Parks, but not for Hatteras. Please don't let ORVs there. You may lose some OVR enthusiasts as visitors, but you will lose many, many more of us who don't want to see OVRs there.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8367	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Supt. Murray, Please accept this letter as my comments on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.</p> <p>After reviewing the NPS DEIS, I must disagree with all of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. I must add, I am appalled at the wildlife management/control practices being exercised in the area at this time. If we are indeed an educated and compassionate people, how can we continue to eradicate various forms of wildlife under the guise of helping others. That is nature's job, we screw up enough, please leave it alone. I feel certain, in time, your current practices are going to attract more attention and become a major issue for which the NPS will be held accountable. Count me as one who looks forward to that day.</p> <p>Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.</p> <p>Sincerely, Leo H. Stiltner</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8368	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	R, J						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:39:10						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8369	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:39:24						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol>						

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. As someone who has spent many summers enjoying the beach at Cape Hatteras, I would like to see it preserved for years to come. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8370    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Stifler, John R  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:39:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Everyone knows the outer banks are a fragile ecosystem. Some care about that fact, some don't. The ones who don't are not stupid; they just haven't understood the principle of long-term benefits, benefits not measurable by this year's tourism figures or by the commercial enjoyment of off-road vehicle drivers and others. The Outer Banks and Cape Hatteras need protection under strong, well-publicized rules about their use, including tight restrictions on off-road vehicles. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8371    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** RICE, KEVIN P  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

SUPPORT: ALTERNATIVE "A"  
- Alternative "A" maximizes visitor use and experience. Limiting use is in direct opposition to the establishment of parks.  
- Alternative "A" provides maximum opportunity within a managed area which minimizes negative impacts elsewhere. Closures encourage visitors to utilize other non-patrolled "off limits" areas.  
- Alternative "A" is cost preferred--it is significantly more cost conscious than other alternatives. It is especially important in the current economy to save and stretch the use of taxpayer dollars.  
- Alternative "A" is the most economically responsible. Protecting business and government revenue is critical in this economy. Providing low-cost recreation to the public is imperative.  
- Alternative "A" maximizes recreation. Recreation is health.  
- Alternative "A" maximizes visitor interaction and appreciation with nature and the environment. Educational material and interpretive signage should be provided to assist the visitor experience.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8372    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wyckoff, Eric  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:39:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. I think that OTVs can use other areas, besides beachfront, where they will have no effect on wildlife or the people who cannot see it elsewhere. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8373    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:39:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Deborah Nicklaus

**Correspondence ID:** 8374    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:40:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8375    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:40:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have experience with ORVs both trespassing on my and other's private property and illegally and inappropriately using public lands around my home in rural Washington state. Despite their pleas that they care about the environment, my repeated experience is that they are thrill seekers who care only about going fast and making noise. They cause erosion, spread nonnative plants, and destroy the natural experience for all within earshot. They consistently cause conflict with non-destructive pedestrian and equestrian users.  
I grew up on the east coast and have visited the Cape Hatteras National Seashore many times. I hope that it will still be in their same condition for my grandchildren to visit. ORV use would threaten that possibility as well as the endangered turtles and seabirds who make the shore their home at various times of the year.  
ORVs are NOT about enjoyment of a natural environment, they are too noisy and create far too much damage. They are increasingly not made i America, and consume oil and gasoline which we must import. The people who claim they need them for recreation would be far better served to get off their fat asses and start getting around on their own two feet. If they are truly disabled, access is guaranteed to them already via wheelchair and other non-destructive means.  
The entire ORV movement has been created by the industry which is concerned only with selling more machines and more profits, not with the preservation of valuable parts of our American heritage such as Cape Hatteras National Seashore.  
I am a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and enjoy mny of national parks, recreation areas, wildlife refuges, and national seashores on a regular basis. Please do your job abd preserve these assets. Do not allow them to be degraded for the wants of a few lazy thrill seekers.

**Correspondence ID:** 8376    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:40:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8377    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:40:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow offshore vehicles on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore!

**Correspondence ID:** 8378    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:40:49



<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The beaches of Cape Hatteras must be maintained for people to enjoy as well as wildlife in the area. There should be an aircraft quiet zone over Cape Hatteras. ORV must be prevented from destroying the seashore and possibly killing wildlife. As with other legislation, rules are usually broken. You can make guidelines for the use of ORV, but in most cases, someone will abuse those rights. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. Earl Markley				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8379	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	,				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:40:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a native North Carolinian and have enjoyed the NC Outer Banks since being taken there by my father in the late 1950s. Both of my children spent many vacations on Ocracoke over the years. ORV access has/is critical for enjoyment of recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Without use of by four wheel drive vehicles taking small children and my aging parents would have been impossible. As I have gotten older I can no longer walk long distances in the soft sand. On April 23th of this year my first grandson was born. Only with ORV access can I hope to pass the love of our coast to my next generation. Please consider you are the keepers of this beautiful piece of North Carolina which actually belongs to all US citizens. Maintaining a proper balance between wildlife and recreation is critical. For the last 40+ years I have worked hard and saved to be able to retire and move to Ocracoke. Next year I finally reach the retirement goal. It has been my plan to buy a house on Ocracoke later this year. With the uncertainty of continued reasonable beech access this plan is on hold. Does beech closure and access restrictions have an economic impact. You bet you it does. I am not alone in my hesitation of investing on the outer banks with the current state of NPS management. I have spent approximately \$5000 per year for over 30 years visiting the islands. Without access this will also stop. The management of access must take into consideration the local economy and impact on local families. Using projected numbers from Kitty Hawk and Nags Head are not reflective of the southern towns. The impact is real and huge! I love wildlife and truly respect the birds and turtles in our park. Protection supported by scientific data is the only reasonable path.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8380	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:40:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8381	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:40:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8382	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:40:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.				

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8383    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please preserve the Cape Hatteras National Seashore for future generations. Not only do off road vehicles destroy natural habitat areas, but they are extremely noisy and bring the drinking crowd to a serene park. It is important to preserve as much of the USA as possible so our future generations can enjoy the natural spaces we now enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8384    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8385    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Tangney, John  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 Below is the letter provided by NPCA, which I totally agree with! However first I wanted to state that as someone who loves to visit our National Parks, Monuments, Seashores, etc. I go there to enjoy the beauty, and wildlife. Having to listen to ORV's, dune buggies, snowmobiles, or other such vehicles should NOT be part of the experience. These areas are the jewels that have been protected. ORV's etc. should not be used in places like this!  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason. "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
 \*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
 Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8386    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should absolutely come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. We are losing our wildlife and we must do everything possible to safeguard the reproduction of turtles and seabirds. We are also losing the grasses that protect the dunes -- I've been down there and seen the effects of dune loss. We are NOT losing ORVs!!!

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8387    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There is no possible true reason to allow ORV's on the beach but a million GREAT reason's not too!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8388    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative to provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife.

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

If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Pedestrians and families 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. Adequate areas free of ORV use year round should be set aside for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species.

A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met.

I have watched sea turtles lay eggs at night on the Atlantic beaches in FL, a state that has laws to protect turtles during laying season. I have tried to save eggs from heavy surf washing them away. Each of us has a role to play in helping wildlife survive the ways of the human population. And the National Park Service's role is a big one.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8389    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8390    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8391    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:41:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8392    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:41:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8393    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:41:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8394    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8395    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8396    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8397    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8398    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8399    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Falbowski, Ellen M

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am against the use of off-road vehicles in wilderness areas where wildlife will be affected. Cape Hatteras is home to many year-round mammals, birds, reptiles and amphibians, and is an important way-station for migrating birds and nesting sea turtles. There is no reason people must take vehicles off-road in the areas where these animals live. Please do not expand access for these vehicles.

**Correspondence ID:** 8400    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

This is wrong what is going on and need to be stopped

**Correspondence ID:** 8401    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8402    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8403    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8404    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 I am writing to you as someone who visited the Cape Hatteras area many times, and who has fond memories of the peaceful environment there. I also have nightmare memories of other places in this country, and overseas, where off-road vehicles have been allowed to destroy natural beauty. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement

privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8405    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hansen, Barbara  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:41:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Our country is falling apart. global warming is killing the planet. Please do the right thing and save a bit of semi-wild places for people and animals. The basic simple things that could turn our country and world around have fallen by the wayside due to greed. Again Please stop in insanity. Save these few places we have left.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8406    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:42:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Our precious national seashores like Cape Hatteras need to be protected as quiet peaceful places where humans can restore their souls and animals and plants can thrive. Off Road vehicles have no place whatsoever in these wild and sacred regions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8407    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:42:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** While I appreciate being able to comment on this important subject, I am disappointed that all public discussion will be over in less than a week. While I am an automotive enthusiast and have taken a couple of off-road excursions in the past, times have changed. Our National Seashore is not a place for off-road vehicles. Time to leave our few unspoiled areas as pristine as possible for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8408    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sidbury, Mercy  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:42:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a native of North Carolina and know how much the shoreline and its environment is part of a national treasure. It would be a tremendous mistake to open the beaches of Cape Hatteras to off road vehicles. The noise, the footprint, the undeniable destruction that the vehicles make on any area that they go is anathema to the pristine natural beauty of the National Seashore. I strongly recommend that off road vehicles not be allowed to enter and utilize the land of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you for considering my opinion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8409    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:42:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
L.A. BASILE

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8410    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:42:51



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Absolutely no vehicles on beaches. It will degrade them and the experience of visiting them.

**Correspondence ID:** 8411    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Landau, John C  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:42:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off-road vehicles harm wildlife and destroy the natural character, beauty, peace and quiet of a nature preserve. They should be banned from all parks, wilderness areas and nature-recreational areas.

**Correspondence ID:** 8412    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
Off road vehicles have no place here. They are contributor's to air and noise pollution and destruction of flora and fauna. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,

**Correspondence ID:** 8413    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:43:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The cape is no place for off road vehicles.

**Correspondence ID:** 8414    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:43:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 8415    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

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

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

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

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

I feel that species such as sea turtles and shore birds already face a mountain of challenges just trying to survive. People need to give a little bit and stop taking so much. It is not going to kill us to cut down on ORV use on Cape Hatteras or on any other seashore. It will kill wildlife or prevent them from breeding if we do not change our use of the beaches. I believe it is selfish of us to be unwilling to bend on this issue. ORV's are not necessary, but a safe habitat for these animals to raise their young is vital to their survival. With all of the other threats facing them, this is something that we can put a stop to that is not going to adversely affect us. I will not vacation on Cape Hatteras until the use of ORV's is drastically reduced. I do not want to be on a beach with noisy vehicles or gas fumes.

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8416    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:43:47  
**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.

Sweet and simple.....PLEASE protect the wildlife with the alternative plan. Thank You. -----

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8417    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:43:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8418    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 13:43:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8419    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:43:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8420    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 With much of our coastline developed the National Seashore provides much needed protection to our beautiful shores. As a protected beach, Cape Hatteras needs to be preserved for enjoyment by all visitors, including those who do not wish to visit the ocean alongside large vehicles that disrupt the peaceful and natural allure of the seashore.  
 Allowing vehicles on the beach not only takes away from the enjoyment of other visitors, it also wrecks havoc on the natural habitat of Cape Hatteras' array of wildlife. Part of the appeal of the seaside is the animals and birds that inhabit it.  
 Please choose to protect the natural and wild elements of Cape Hatteras so that they can be enjoyed by all types of visitors for generations to come.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8421    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:43:56  
**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:** 8422    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:43:56  
**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:** 8423    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:43:56  
**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:** 8424    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:43:56  
**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:** 8425    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:43:56  
**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.  
I was lucky enough to visit these shores and see the sealife and birds there, I ONLY WANT THE SAME FOR MY CHILDREN AND GRAND-CHILDREN!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8426    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:44:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I hope to be able to visit the beaches without noise and disturbance of wildlife. I appreciate this plan's provision for more non-ORV uses of 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:** 8427    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:44:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8428    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

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

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

Please, please, please - - put the welfare of the birds and turtles ahead of any short-term "fun" for off-roaders. We must do everything in our power to protect and preserve these precious natural resources for future generations.

The important points are:

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8429    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hunt, Otto J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:44:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am a supporter of national parks, and I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8430    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:44:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Protect this vulnerable national treasure

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8431    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:44:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

So much of this planet is occupied by people and their noisy, polluting "toys". Wildlife and the protection of pristine areas for nature walks and non-intrusive observation must be prioritized if we are to preserve natural habitats for future generations. Respect for the environment is respect for all earth inhabitants. We are guardians and keepers who simply must limit indulgence of the growing voracious hunger for artificial entertainment that is increasingly disrupting the balance of nature world-wide. Please do not allow this area to be deconstructed for use of artificial motor play that disregards the serenity, beauty and repose we seek at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8432	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:45:04					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>DONT LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!  This will disproportionately dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors.  Thank You,  Martin Rapalski</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8433	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Macklin, Roger L					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:45:47					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,  As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  Sincerely, Roger L. Macklin</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8434	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,  As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) Even in Texas where they allow vehicles (primarily 4-wheel drive) to drive on the beaches, ORV's are specifically NOT allowed because of their easy ability to drive in the dunes, recklessness and carelessness of the people they are marketed to, speeds they can reach on sand that 4-wheel trucks cannot, etc.</li> <li>4) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8435	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:46:16					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."</li> </ol>					

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8436	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Peele, Donna L					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:46:27					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I disagree with the proposed language regarding pets on the beach. As an island resident for over 20 years some of my most favorite time of the day is hitting the beach early in the morning with my guys. Currently I have two Golden Retrievers and as you know they are water hounds!! They are a part of my family and as a responsible pet owner I really do not want that right taken away. If there are people that do not obey the rules, then deal with them, do not take all rights away for the sins of a few.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8437	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:46:37					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I wish these beautiful places would be left alone...					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8438	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:46:54					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep the beaches of Cape Hatteras free of off-road vehicles. Allowing off-road vehicles on the beach will cause erosion, the death of vegetation and small beach creatures, noise & exhaust pollution, and ruin a beautiful and peaceful place enjoyed by many. Must oil addicted humans destroy each and every god given natural resource?					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8439	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:47:03					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8440	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:47:14					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>					



<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8441	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:47:20						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please protect this beautiful place.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8442	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Hickey, Jane A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:47:39						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a visitor to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore I have enjoyed the scenery, quiet natural beauty, and endangered wildlife that make this beach a real gem. I am writing to express opposition to the proposed ORV management plan. As an avid environmentalist I believe that allowing ORV traffic on this beach would endanger habitat and take away the intended experience for visitors. Thank you, Jane Hickey						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8443	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Neville, Paula L						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:47:44						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please protect this area from destruction. We need to preserve wilderness now or it will be lost forever.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8444	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:48:01						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not allow off road vehicles to destroy the beautiful beaches & wildlife habitat of Cape Hatteras. I enjoy the beaches, wildlife & lighthouses very much. I love NC & visit often. Sincerely, Gwen King						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8445	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:48:05						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>The first page of your Draft Plan for Off-Road Vehicle Management on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore (part of which is cited in the final paragraph below) points out the problem inherent in our modern democracy. The fact that ANY OFF-ROAD VEHICLE (ORV) USE IN A NATIONAL PARK IS INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE FIDUCIARY RESPONSIBILITY OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE (NPS) TO PROTECT AND DEFEND THAT PARK is never considered. This is due to the power of the paid lobbyists in Congress and the moneyed interests that they represent; and to the political appointees to head the various agencies that should protect our national heritage. Most of these appointees are former managers in the industries whose very existence depends on the free and unbridled use and degradation of our national treasures. Executive Orders 11644 and 11989 DO NOT DICTATE THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PERMIT ORV USE ON ANY OF THE LAND THAT IT WAS CREATED TO PROTECT. These Executive Orders dictate what and how the NPS must do IF IT ALLOWS ORVs.</p> <p>I know the reader of this comment probably agrees with its content BUT I also know that "NO ORVs" is NOT one of the proposed alternatives. Because of that fact I recommend Alternative "D" as being the least destructive alternative presented.</p> <p>"This draft Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (plan/EIS) evaluates the impacts of a range of alternatives for regulations and procedures that would carefully manage off-road vehicle (ORV) use/access in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore (Seashore) to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources and natural processes, to provide a variety of visitor use experiences while minimizing conflicts among various users, and to promote the safety of all visitors. Executive Order 11644 of 1972, amended by Executive Order 11989 of 1977, requires certain federal agencies permitting ORV use on agency lands to publish regulations designating specific trails and areas for this use. Title 36, section 4.10 of the Code of Federal Regulations implements the executive orders by providing that routes and areas designated for ORV use shall be promulgated as special regulations. Upon conclusion of this plan and decision-making process, the alternative selected for implementation will become the ORV management plan and will form the basis for a special regulation, guiding the management and control of ORVs at the Seashore for the next 10 to 15 years."</p> <p>Sincerely, Eric Jones</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8446	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Costa, Demelza						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I absolutely DO NOT support any off road vehicle 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. It is wrong and not legal that Cape Hatteras National Seashore will be dominated by ORV use. The following three areas of concern are of extreme importance to arrive at a fair, comprehensive and balanced management plan. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for this opportunity to submit my concerns.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8447	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:48:07						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Sirs:</p> <p>I have waited for years to visit the Outer Banks area of NC. When I get there I expect to see a peaceful pristine environment without the noise and damage any vehicles would cause. I have had to deal with "personal water craft" at the lake and "ski-mobiles" in the mountains. Please do not allow this</p>						

area to be spoiled by "toys" used by a minority of visitors. You have a sacred trust to protect fragile areas of our country for future generations.  
Sincerely,  
Susan Cassella

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8448	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Cannatella, John					
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 13:48:10					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>What have we come to? We have lost our cities and much of our forestlands to vehicle endangerment and pollution. Now, for the purpose of our amusement and recreation, we will contaminate our beaches and the eco system that sustains all life on the planet. It is another suicidal attempt to distance ourselves from the very nurturing environment that enables us to breathe and survive. Our machines are now more important than sea and forest life and the very human beings that created them. Dr. Frankenstein lives!</p> <p>Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today.</p> <p>John Cannatella</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8449	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8450	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 13:48:18					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Upon review of the report I note that kite flying is a serious concern of the NPS. I have been visiting Hatteras since 2000, and typically bring 10-12 other people between my family and friends. I as a kiteboarder, love coming to Cape Hatteras, renting a house and spending time in the water. We tend to eat out, buy food locally (can't beat the seafood!), and I try to buy gear at Real as they have an excellent selection and prices.</p> <p>If access to kiteboarding is compromised, I fear that the attraction of Cape Hatteras will be lost. Alternatively I've been looking at South Padre Island as our new vacation sight. In addition to my family, for most kiteboarders in Ontario and Quebec, the trip to Hatteras is a yearly or bi-yearly affair. If access for kites is cut back, these families and groups will look to alternative locations such as Miami, Oregon, South Carolina and South Padre Island to vacation and kiteboard.</p> <p>I hope that access is maintained and not cut off without consideration of the loss that it will cause to both the kiteboarding community, but also the local economy.</p> <p>Regards, Randal Brown Toronto, Ontario</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8451	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Popiel, Ken j					
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 13:48:26					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>SUPPORT: ALTERNATIVE "A"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alternative "A" maximizes visitor use and experience. Limiting use is in direct opposition to the establishment of parks.</li> <li>- Alternative "A" provides maximum opportunity within a managed area which minimizes negative impacts elsewhere. Closures encourage visitors to utilize other non-patrolled "off limits" areas.</li> </ul>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8452	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 13:48:30					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p>					

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Most Sincerely, Kimberly Anne Halizak

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8453    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:48:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Negotiated Rulemaking and Management Plan/EIS  
The off-road vehicle crowd gets pushy when anyone tells them they cannot go anywhere they want to go. Unfortunately, the environmentalists are not a pushy and get pushed around. There are sandy place for off-road riders to go that are not nearly as sensitive as a beach, especially one in a National Park. My choice is to not allow any off-road vehicles on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore beach. SDD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8454    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:48:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I seriously disagree to the NPS proposal to inact Alternative F for overseeing the Cape Hatteras National Parks. I am a Hatteras property owner and longtime vistor to Hatteras Island.The national Parks Service was created not only for protection of wildlife but also for the use by the American citizen. I do not see that Alternative F is taking into consideration anything pertaining to the rights of the American public as far as access to the parks and beaches. For years the visitors and full time residents of the island have enjoyed a symbotic and respectful co-existence with nature pertaining to wildlife and the enviroment on Hatteras island. The draconian measures suggested by the NPS with regards to 1000 ft. buffers and total elimination of both vehicular and pedestrian access to the beach is not was intended by our forefathers when legislation was passed creating our national park system. This in addition to the disatrous effect on the local economy is reason enough to vote against the Alteranative F proposal. Surely a more common ground can be found between the NPS and the concerned citizens of Hatteras Island.  
Best Regards,  
Chris Bolton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8455    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:48:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8456    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:49:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8457    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely, Roy C Tremain

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8458    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:49:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Plain and simple: I have spent many vacations in our National Parks - including Cape Hattaras NS. PLEASE keep off-road vehicles out! Thank you for allowing me to voice my opinion on what I consider to be an important matter for our National Park system.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8459    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:49:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,  
Please be advised that having lived in a beach area I am very aware of the noise and damage that off road vehicles can cause. I am totally opposed to their use in this setting.  
Paula Shindledecker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8460    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McDaniel, Mark  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
OHV recreation is not compatible with any wilderness values and should not be permitted on lands managed to preserve it's wild character. In general, OHV are destructive of topsoil and vegetation, degrade air quality with excessive dust and combustion emissions, and disrupt the natural sound scape of undeveloped land. Often times, OHV riders are aggressive and intentionally intimidate other trail users. While I appreciate the utility and value of OHV in appropriate uses, they are too often the first to abuse their responsibilities when using open space and easily do the greatest harm to those resources. OHV popularity continues to grow and must be managed effectively. I do not think OHV use should be permitted off a designated route, and definitely has no place within National Parks.  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8461    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Nieland, Tom  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:49:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please stop off-road vehicles from destroying any more habitat, particularly on the fragile lands of Cape Hatteras! The USA has already experienced far too much loss of precious lands to unauthorized/unwise off-roading-no more!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8462    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:50:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** our environment matters

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8463    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** D'Ottavio, Donna K  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:50:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off-road vehicles do horrendous damage to the soil, the plants, and the animals wherever they are used. Why you are even considering opening public lands, a public park, to these noisy, polluting, destructive vehicles is incomprehensible to me. If there are private individuals with land (and private land or not, it better not be land containing habitat that is vital to the continued existence of ANY plant or animal species) that they don't have enough respect or care for, to allow it to be torn up in this way, let them open their land up to this kind of disrespecting miss-treatment. Do not permit it in or on the lands that belong to me. For the Park lands DO belong to me, and to every other American who loves them. And we love them for the very things that the off-roaders destroy: the soul- and spirit-rejuvenating peace and beauty, the fascinating animal and plant life, the freedom from the cities' pollution of noise, filth, humanity, and buildings. The only things the off-roaders don't bring with them are the buildings. I believe that the original purpose of the off-road vehicles, like that of the snowmobiles, was to allow access to places, and in certain weather, which otherwise would be inaccessible. Keep ORVs AND snowmobiles out of the Parks except for the necessary use of the Park personnel. Thank you. Donna D'Ottavio

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8464    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:50:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8465    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Leppla, Joan & Mike  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:50:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect the beaches and wildlife at Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore. My husband and I have vacationed there and we both feel that wildlife must be protected from unnecessary human activity. We are not likely to vacation there in the future if off-road vehicles will be on the sea shore disrupting natural habitat and wildlife.  
Sincerely, Joan & Mike Leppla

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8466    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of

the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Cheryle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8467    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:50:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please reconsider your plan to allow off-road vehicles on the shores off Cape Hatteras! These shores are national treasures, and ought to be kept safe for wildlife and plant life. Off-roaders have plenty of other designated trails for pursuing their hobby!  
Thank you for your attention and consideration to this important matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8468    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Koepp, W. Philip  
**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."  
Sincerely,  
W. Philip Koepp  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8469    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Deck, Robert T  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I welcome the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource on the Outer Banks of North Carolina, which is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, provided it recognizes the following points.  
1) Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8470    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:51:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Beaches are for children, for long walks, for staring into the sea, for napping, for little sand crabs-they are not for vehicles

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8471    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:51:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** IT ONLY MAKES GOOD COMMON SENSE!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8472    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:51:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am very distressed that you are considering Off Road Vehicle use along the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I am a former resident of South Carolina and have many fond memories of visiting the Outer Banks. I always treasured those visits because the seashore was pristine and quiet - very unlike most beaches in South Carolina that were overrun with people, businesses and litter.  
 I'm appalled that you may be allowing the use of ORV in such a beautiful and pristine area. You will greatly increase noise pollution and these vehicles pose grave threats to pedestrians and wildlife (not to mention the idiots who operate them routinely).  
 By allowing such use you will be destroying this beautiful bit of coastline by bringing in people who are completely unconcerned with anything other than destroying nature in pursuit of a cheap thrill. If you don't think that's the case, please spend an afternoon in the Arizona desert to see how ORV enthusiasts act and what types of people ORV access attracts.  
 Please reconsider this idea and keep this natural wonder intact. There is no need, whatsoever, to open it up to wanton destruction in exchange for a few cheap thrills on a 4-wheeler.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8473    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:51:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
 I do Sincerely hope that you will adhere to the original intent of the Park Service in this case. Sincerely, Mike Turner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8474    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:51:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Must we always disregard nature for our own selfish recreation. Ride a bike. Walk. Hike. Keep motorized vehicles off the shoreline on Cape Hatteras!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8475    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ratcliff, Philip J  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:51:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I urge policymakers to implement the modified Alternative D, for Cape Hatteras. This is the best plan to preserve the uniqueness of the Cape. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8476    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Poss, Joan P  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:51:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We desperately need to keep the Cape Hatteras National Seashore free from off-road vehicles which interfere with habitat and cause environmental degradation.  
 Our population keeps growing; people flock to open space. We need to preserve what we have left.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8477    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the

0011201

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8478	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Swan, Rita				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:52:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not allow all-terrain off road vehicles or any recreational vehicles with engines on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Those vehicles always disturb wildlife, plants, and the fragile soil. Also, Americans need to do a lot more walking for their health.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8479	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:52:11						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We are regular visitors to Ocracoke Island, coming down at least once a year since 1993. While I understand the need to protect indigenous species and their habitats, we feel the boundaries are much too large. Also, we feel any further closing of the beaches on Ocracoke should be considered separately from the rest of the proposal, due to the economic impact this would have on the village. We are currently in negotiation to purchase a home on Ocracoke, so this issue is vitally important to us. As the proposal stands now, we must support Alternative F. Thank you.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8480	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Futrell, Sherrill				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:52:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	If you approve an ORV management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I guarantee that I will never visit - just as I never visit Coral Pink Sand Dunes in Utah or other "parks" that disproportionately allow year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors. I don't go to Yellowstone in winter, either, because of the snowmobile racket. What on earth is going on with you people? I have spent a LOT of money and time as a volunteer working HARD in national parks, so am I a better steward than you all are?				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8481	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Henderson, DeWitt				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:52:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am against all ORV use on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, or if it 'must' be allowed, only in certain designated areas, which will destroy a minimum of plant & animal life!!!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8482	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:52:32						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I don't understand how such a proposal could be even considered. The place we are discussing is a fragile ecological treasure. Let the off-roaders get their butts off their noisy pollution-spewing machines, walk the area and try to learn how to appreciate that which they seek to destroy. No, no...NO on this proposal!						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8483	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Schaub, John P				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:52:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8484	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am strongly opposed to ORV use in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore area at all but understand that some use is most likely unavoidable. When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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.

Sincerely, Donna Greathouse-Neel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8485    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:53:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8486    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:53:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
There is no compelling reason to expand ORV use on the Cape Hatteras beaches. There are many reasons to restrict or deny their use in this protected, sensitive environment.  
Sincerely,  
Carol Youngs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8487    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:53:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow off-road vehicles to dominate the use of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Access by foot is absolutely sufficient for people to appreciate the wonders of this national treasure. Recreational vehicles are destructive to the seashore and its flora and fauna, not to mention the disruption to the serenity sought by persons NOT using off-road vehicles. It would be a travesty of the first order to allow off-road vehicles to destroy the very resource they want to use. Recreational off-road vehicles and nature are mutually exclusive entities, and should never be allowed to merge.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8488    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Onasch, Otto F  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:53:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the seashore for wildlife. A few walking trails and NO motorized vehicles of any sort. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8489    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:53:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please DO NOT open the Cape Hatteras National Seashore to off-road vehicles! As we have seen in the Red Rocks of Utah, this leads to massive destruction of the beautiful, fragile environment and has extremely deleterious effects on wildlife. Opening the pristine shores of Cape Hatteras to this type of activity frequented by irresponsible, intoxicated persons would be a national tragedy!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8490    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kirkland, Kathy  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:53:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please adopt modified Alternative D and do not allow off road vehicles on Cape Hatteras Nat'l Seashore. This environment needs to be protected and preserved. As a dedicated birder, I would avoid visiting any place that values ORV above protecting wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8491    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** pan, pinky jain  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason. "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely, pinky jain pan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8492    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Katz, Donalee  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:53:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason. "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sincerely, Donalee Katz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8493    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Boyer, Mary T  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
Why is it so hard to protect our Parks? Why are ORV's even being allowed near our treasures?!!  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason. "Except for certain portions of

the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Mary T. Boyer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8494    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:53:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The preservation of the shoreline free of the degradation of automobile and such is essential to the preservation of America in that the respect re-quired is indicative of the respect we have for all aspects of our country--we must not deface it!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8495    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:54:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** ORVs should not be allowed on a sensitive area such as Cape Hatteras Seashore. Although I'm sure some people will ride carefully and slowly enough to avoid crushing bird eggs and tearing the dunes apart, I'm equally sure that some people will go there for the sole purpose of doing just that. Additionally, the noise these vehicles make is obnoxious to pedestrian traffic and can have severe negative effects on birds. Please find and read the following papers for more insight on the effects of noise pollution on wildlife - they're quite strong.  
FRANCIS, C. D., ORTEGA, C. P. & CRUZ, A. (2009). Noise Pollution Changes Avian Communities and Species Interactions. *Current Biology* 19, 1415-1419.  
HABIB, L., BAYNE, E. M. & BOUTIN, S. (2007). Chronic industrial noise affects pairing success and age structure of ovenbirds *Seiurus aurocapilla*. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 44, 176-184.  
LIMA, S. L. (2009). Predators and the breeding bird: behavioral and reproductive flexibility under the risk of predation. *Biological Reviews* 84, 485-513.  
RHEINDT, F. E. (2003). The impact of roads on birds: Does song frequency play a role in determining susceptibility to noise pollution? *Journal Fur Ornithologie* 144, 295-306.  
SWADDLE, J. P. & PAGE, L. C. (2007). High levels of environmental noise erode pair preferences in zebra finches: implications for noise pollution. *Animal Behaviour* 74, 363-368.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8496    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:54:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8497    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hamilton, Jean P  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:54:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am completely opposed to the proposal to allow off road vehicles on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Jean Hamilton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8498    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Doner, Leslee  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:54:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D,

if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Leslee

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8499    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Genin, Merideth K  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:54:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan, and I wish you and yours health and peace.  
Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8500    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Haigh, Kristi  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:55:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please, please modify plans to allow ORV at Cape Hatteras according to Alternative D with modifications as suggested by NPCA. This is a fragile environment and ORV's are not consistent with reducing our carbon footprints.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8501    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Amundson, Beret  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:55:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** These are the exact landscapes that need to be protected for the American People, the American Wildlife. Please, this is your responsibility. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8502    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:55:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs:  
Please, the plans should be to reduce, limit, deny plans for ORV use on our beaches, Cape Hatteras, etc.  
It makes no sense to encourage a use which has been proved to be detrimental to marine and beach/coastal life. We see it first hand on our trips to beaches, where we walk. We see it on video clips and news reports. We read it in scientific surveys, that motorized use along beaches contributes to species disruption and death.  
In addition it makes no sense to encourage a use of a valuable energy source which is becoming more expensive and will become rarer. Homo sapiens needs to use his legs. He can still do damage there, but not by as large a factor as if he is motorized.  
We face a future in which petroleum based energy is changing. We need to conserve its use for those things which are essential and critical. The ability to range up and down our beaches for fun and pleasure on powered vehicles is neither essential nor critical.  
Please, I am 76 and do not want to leave a damaged planet behind me.  
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8503    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Elliott, Shannon  
**Received:** May,07,2010 13:55:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement

privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8504    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Rusk, Cornelia  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:55:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a longtime lover of the natural qualities of National Parks, I'm appalled at the thought of vehicles taking over any of the parks.

**Correspondence ID:** 8505    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hill, Robert D  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:55:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The use of Off Road Vehicles needs to be limited to non viable areas where wildlife and pedestrian traffic is frequent and the silence of nature can be respected. The effects of erosion from Off Road Vehicles must definitely be determined in any plans for their use. It is essential that no Off Road Vehicle use be allowed to negatively impact wildlife, especially threatened wildlife and such wildlife on the Endangered Species list. This definitely includes all consideration regarding plant life. Water, air and noise pollution must be also be determined in the plans prior to implementation and review guidelines to correct negative results.

**Correspondence ID:** 8506    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 13:56:08  
**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 vacationers and other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches.  
All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors - that's wrong.  
Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Ramona Dzindzeleta

**Correspondence ID:** 8507    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

ORV, snowmobiles, gas engine powered boats, PWC, etc have NO place in any National Park/Seashore/Wilderness area. These places are set aside for everyone to enjoy in their natural state. The noise pollution and ecological damage done by gas engine mechanical machines destroys these sensitive areas. There are plenty of other public areas to operate these machines.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Tom Emme

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8508	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:56:29						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It's ridiculous to set aside protected lands so morons can joyride through them. Instead of doing so, why not put the funding and consideration into educating people on why ORV are so damaging to the environment.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8509	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:56:34						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Beaches are not for vehicles !						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8510	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Smith, Sandra D						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:57:03						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	All National Parks and Recreation areas should be maintained in as quiet and undisturbed as possible. I go to the mountains or sea shore for peace. Noisy ATV have no place there						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8511	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:57:05						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	In general, beaches should be off limits to ORVs. Using ORVs damages beaches and harms wildlife. ORV use is also limiting to pedestrians on the beach. Beach quality and health will be diminished by expanding ORV use at Cape Hatteras.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8512	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:57:23						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	No ORV on park land!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8513	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:57:40						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep off road vehicles off Cape Hatteras national SeaShore. We cannot repair the damage they would cause to this delightful site. Nature deserve the chance to thrive and off road vehceles are an antithisis to this.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8514	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:57:51						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep off road vehicles off the beach. There must be somewhere else they can ride that wont disturb other visitors to this beautiful,serene beach. The land torn up by off road vehicles may never recover in my lifetime if ever. Thank you.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8515	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:57:57						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please protect this beautiful land.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8516	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:58:45						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of</p>						

the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8517	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:59:05						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There are too many beaches no longer safe for families to spend a carefree day together. Please don't allow traffic on this beach to cause parents the headache of making sure their children are safe from being hit while playing in the sand.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8518	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:59:38						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Irresponsible off road vehicle use is responsible for deterioration of wildlife habitats and has eroded the human experience in these areas. We must acknowledge the harmful effects of ORV use and develop plans that protect these areas. I strongly support the DEIS. Thank you.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8519	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 13:59:52						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	With the horrible spill in Louisiana, my concern for natural habitats has increased. I certainly do not want to see anymore innocent life destroyed by greed. Enough is enough.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8520	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:00:26						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It May Concern: When I state that I am opposed to beach driving, it is due to the fact that I have had first hand experience with beaches that are treated as thoroughfares, rather than preserved as a natural habitat for marine life. Most beachgoers prefer the many wonders of a natural marine environment unencumbered by vehicles. I have lived in the City of St. Augustine Beach, Florida for 27 years. Although beach driving is now regulated more than it ever has been before, vehicles still enter the beach at night and run rampant on the beach. Through the years I've witnessed cars driving up into the dunes, drunk drivers speeding and doing "donuts," marine birds killed as the result of being run over by vehicles, and endangered sea turtle hatchlings run over by vehicles as well. Eventually, Anastasia State Park closed its beaches to beach driving after two young girls who were sun bathing were run over by an unattentive beach driver. Last I heard, the young ladies were still disabled; one is still in a coma. Thankfully, the beach at Fort Matanzas National Monument has been closed to vehicles as well. Why? Drivers repeated ran over endangered least Tern nests. As the case in Anastasia State Park, this pedestrian friendly beach is enjoyed as a safe haven for beachgoers and marine life. Please take my advise and keep your beach free of dangerous, polluting off road vehicles. Yours Truly, Laura Braly						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8521	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:01:18						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Pleas vote no on the NPS alternative F propoasal for Hatters Island national parks. As a longtime visitor I would be at a great loss not being able to access the beaches of Hatteras Island. The beauty and enviroment of the park system is second to none and restricting beach acces would be ludicrous im my opinion. The park system and people have coexisted beautifilly over the years. I understand the need for protection of the natural wildlife however propasal F borders on the absurd. Please re-think the issues and come with a better propasal than this. Nancy Bolton						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8522	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:01:25						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Don L. Watson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8523    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Taylor Jr, S Fred  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:01:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't let these vehicles over run our beaches and parts. How about let's just do some walking. The people of this country are already to fat. thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8524    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:01:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've seen what OHV's have done and (unfortunately) continue to do at the Oceano Dunes in CA. OHV's are destructive to the landscape and wildlife (plovers and other shore birds as well as coyote, bobcat, deer, etc.) habitat. And for the people who want to enjoy the beauty and tranquility of the shorescape, it's not possible with noisy, particulate churning, gas guzzling, fume belching OHV's.  
Please don't allow this destructive activity at this (or any other) beautiful National Park.  
Sincerely,  
Watson Gooch

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8525    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bloch, Charles  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:01:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
This country needs to limit itself to one environmental disaster at a time. Please don't start another one.  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8526    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
The current oil spill disaster in the Gulf reinforces both the intent and need to preserve all of our fragile beaches' ecosystems, no matter where they are located. Whether it is ORV's, oil spills or just too many visitors, once the beaches are destroyed we will not get them back!  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8527    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO OFF ROAD VEHICLES!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8528    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Basilone, Joe  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter



**Correspondence:** Joe Basilone 5801 Hawthorn Lane Williamsburg, VA 23185 Property owner, 39191 Sunfish Ct., Avon NC

Comments concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore at the Hampton VA meeting, April 29, 2010. I do not agree with the DEIS failure to adequately recognize the cultural considerations inherent in combined ORV use and surf fishing in the CHNS. The 800 page DEIS lacks meaningful content dedicated to cultural resource issues. Dictionary.com defines "culture" as: "the behaviors and beliefs characteristic of a particular social, ethnic, or age group." NPS Guidelines state: "A landscape can also constitute Traditional Cultural Property if it is a location where a community has traditionally carried out economic or other cultural practices important in maintaining its historic identity." The behaviors and beliefs of ORV ? surf fishermen are definitely those of a particular social group. And it is a group that has been established for almost a century. Our very presence here tonight is undisputable testimony to our dedication to maintaining the traditions and economics important in maintaining our historic identity. The first book about surf fishing, The Call of the Surf, by Van Campen Heilner and Frank Stick was copyrighted in 1920. The first ferries began in the mid-1920s when Capt. Toby Tillet established a tug and barge service across Oregon Inlet to Hatteras Island. The motor vehicles Capt. Tillet brought to Hatteras Island drove on the sand. There were no roads. Heilner's best seller, Salt Water Fishing, first copyrighted in 1937, contains a photo of a model T Ford on the beach at Hatteras. The model T has balloon tires and tackle boxes. A surf fisherman is standing beside it with a big drum. And Heilner refers to it as a "beach buggy." The NC Beach Buggy Assoc. and the Cape Hatteras Anglers Club are two of the largest organized groups that are "particular to this social group." These groups and others have been sharing the camaraderie and energy of fishing on the beach for many decades. The DEIS is in conflict with itself when it simultaneously advocates severely restricted access and yet acknowledges on page 83 that ORV access is historical in nature.

I disagree with the DEIS on page 136 where it prohibits pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season from March 15 to July 31. The Park Service already has the ability to cite pet owners who fail to comply with the current leash regulations.

I disagree with the DEIS on Pages 121-127 and page 468 where it describes the limited ORV corridors and inflexible buffers. These excessive restrictions are not based on any objective science. ORVs and pedestrians should be given reasonable pass through corridors to access all areas of the beach. The DEIS fails to provide documentation that ORV use has resulted I an significant wildlife damage.

I agree with the access proposals contained in the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access document provided to the National Park Service.

I do not agree with the fact that the current DEIS fails to recognize the previous NPS defacto regulations which determined when and where ORV use was permitted. These regulations were in use for decades and appeared to control and regulate ORV use in a reasonable manner. The DEIS certainly does not provide a history of environmental damage, major or minor during the time these regulations were in use.

- Insert of image of a scanned copy of the above mentioned "Beach Buggy". Scanned text reads: "Above, a typical "beach buggy" especially equipped for fishing. The ideal rig in which to traverse the miles of sandy beaches along both coastlines. Aluminum paint prevents rusting. The fish is a channel bass. On the opposite page: The Surfman."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8529    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to state my opposition to Over the Road Vehicle use in Cape Hatteras National Park System.  
I understand that rules and regulations are being written to regulate the use of such vehicles. I would prefer 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.  
These people with this type of vehicle do not have to be allowed to drive in our national parks. They can drive on their own land, not public land.  
Sincerely  
Paul Hopkins

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8530    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Schymanski, Karen  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:02:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sincerely,  
Karen Schymanski

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8531    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association, a supporter of national parks, and a visitor to Cape Hatteras beaches since childhood, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
William L. Snyder

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8532    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Fogarty, Dan/Paula  
**Received:** May.07.2010 14:02:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras is a National treasure, and so to allow off-road vehicles is almost incredulous in such a setting. I hope you will see the wisdom of keeping this area free of this kind of influence.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8533    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 14:02:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Each summer I vacation at Cape Hatteras with my young, rambunctious grandchildren. I feel strongly that the beaches belong to people and wildlife, not to people on machines. While dedication of separate areas to off road vehicles provides some measure of pedestrian safety - protection of the environment and wildlife are vastly important, too, and are not treated very respectfully by these vehicles. I think people, wildlife and environment deserve a heavily weighted share of the park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8534    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ostgaard, Wendy  
**Received:** May.07.2010 14:02:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Don't you think enough of our natural heritage has been destroyed??? Do people with off-road vehicles really have to destroy land that would be there for generations to come??? When will our polititions have the courage to do what is right? Stop this madness.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8535    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** whalen, shirley m  
**Received:** May.07.2010 14:03:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras and its environs are too beautiful and significant to allow orv's and the influx of camper vehicles to destroy the beaches, the shorelines. We had enough Noreasters and hurricanes do that naturally. Do not allow vehicles to spoil these near pristine beaches and shore lines. The grasses holding the sands is fragile and once broken down by vehicles, it does not regeminate. I and my family and my "to be" husband spent many many hours vacationing and walking along these areas - and even when the rains kept putting out our tiny deep dish fire as we tried to cook 2 hot dogs - it was wonderful. The peaceful serenity and calming effects of the wave action, plus the singing of the grains of sand cannot be duplicated anywhere. DO NOT ALLOW VEHICLES OF ANY TYPE, KIND, DESCRIPTION into these areas. They have destroyed so many areas of the western lands where we now live. The noise pollution, the destruction of the land and vegetation makes you want to cry. It will never be pristine again. The vegetation won't grow back as its root structures will be gone forever. Think of the surface of the moon and it has no people on it. Is this what you want for Hatteras???? A Virginia native living in the west where the vehicle destruction makes one cry.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8536    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kinsey, Graeme  
**Received:** May.07.2010 14:03:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please reconsider your thoughts about exposing Cape Hatteras National Seashore to activities that are better held at the county fairgrounds! The whole purpose of managing such a delicate area is to preserve it for the world to enjoy, not to allow it to be destroyed. Off road vehicle owners typically show no respect for the environment in which they are intruding, and must be prohibited forever. Please accept your responsibility for the duty you pledged to uphold as you protect this priceless resource from the whims of engine-hungry, noisy, polluting, environmentally insensitive predators. Regards, Graeme Kinsey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8537    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07.2010 14:03:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep vehicles off my beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8538    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 14:03:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8539    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Franchitto, Dana L

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:03:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Staff@ PEPC, It is my understanding that off-road vehicles may soon be permitted along the shores of Cape Hatteras. Please don't let this happen. Yes, we all drive auto but these days ,it is so important for people to find refuge from the pollution, noise and litter engendered by off road vehicles. Why should the natural beauty of Hatteras be compromised by vehicles? nature's treasures are delicate and irreplaceable. Please keep hatteras free of motor vehicles . Thank you very much. Sincerely, Dana Franchitto PO Box 109 S.WEIlfleet, MA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8540    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Beedie, Rob

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

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** HATTERAS ISLAND SURF FILM FESTIVAL Pages 4 and 5 [http://www.globalsurfnetwork.com/hatteras\\_island\\_surf\\_film\\_festival/4/26/2010/www.HatterasIslandSurfFilmFestival.com](http://www.globalsurfnetwork.com/hatteras_island_surf_film_festival/4/26/2010/www.HatterasIslandSurfFilmFestival.com) Free beach access is vitally important to all beach lovers, whether they just stroll on them in the midnight breeze or if they are trying to catch the big one that just barely got away. As for surfers, they are always willing to share their special stories of how hollow it was or as fishermen do, how big it was, but the special stories are always those shared with friends when they catch it just right, uncrowded, with their friends. Throughout the '60s was the best of times because it felt like our very own paradise. Yes, time does change many things, and we know that it is often times called progress. Once again, as fishermen, surfers, and just ordinary beach lovers, we know that if any beach in the world closes off access, then we have all lost. Crowding people into "commercial zones" is never a viable alternative. In the case of the Outer Banks and, especially Cape Hatteras, we all know that it isn't the buildings, it isn't the glitter, nor is it hype that attracts the masses. It is an attraction that few areas are blessed with at all. God did this area well. Most people don't realize how really perfect it is. It is simply the ocean, the beaches, the friendliness of locals, and the sense of peace that the area naturally offers. I have no answers, nor do I have a viable solution, but I know for sure that, yes, the environment is important, but certainly not the most important. Beach access, free beach access is the attraction and the freedom is worth protecting. If this right is denied to those who love this area the most, then what we have really lost is our rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Aren't we as Americans guaranteed those rights? Shame on those who are blinded by either greed or by some misguided environmental political power move that blinds their perspective. Human rights should be held in the highest regard and those who have never set foot on the sands of Cape Hatteras to fish, surf, or even walk, will never understand nature's freedom and how it enriches one's soul. Collectively we all are caretakers of the coast and have been long before this controversial issue. I pray that the decision-makers rule in favor of exactly what the locals' desire and that blind ignorance doesn't prevail. Just look north to Virginia or south to Myrtle Beach and then breathe in the salt air slowly in Hatteras. What you're breathing in is freedom, and that is definitely worth protecting and educating others of its value. Those opposing freedom should leave well enough alone and go home. I predict maybe a long battle, and at times it may even feel like a losing battle, but the Hatteras I have grown to know always seems to win. Why, you may ask, and I'll say simply just this ? because it's Hatteras. If your community wins, we all win.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8541    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Martin, James D

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:04:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** You are determined to destroy every peaceful tidbit of space in the US.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8542    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Garnant, Gregory

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:04:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, As a conservation biologist, member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

0011213

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8543    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:04:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

PLEASE KEEP ORV'S OFF CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!

As a person who has lived in a beach community for over 30 years I hope you can see that Hatteras National Seashore will suffer disproportionately if you dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors.

This Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8544    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:04:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8545    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and

0011214

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8546    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McCreary, Jan C  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Jan McCreary

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8547    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Walberg, George  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:05:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No machines please,I believe there are other places for that.Why can't we have Parks with no noise?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8548    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Dorshkind, Larry  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:05:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sample Letter

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8549    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Aloha, Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established,

0011215

Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8550    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Smith, Sean  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:05:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sean Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8551    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Overman, Sue A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:05:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** These natural areas are so priceless, and should be kept as natural as possible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8552    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** wang, ruby  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:05:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please preserve the natural resources. The off-road vehicle will not only create traffic chaotic, but also is going to interrupt the serene atmosphere, most importantly it generates unsafe environment for pedestrians and the wildlife as well. Please don't allow it happen!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8553    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Feltner, Mark  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Public Comment to: National Park Service Meeting Hapton, Virginia April 29th, 2010  
Public Comment on: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)  
Public Comments by: Virginia Coastal Access Now  
? For the public record, I'm Mark Feltner, President of Virginia Coastal Access Now (VCAN) 1356 Pamlico Boulevard, Chesapeake, Virginia 23322. VCAN is our non-profit group that represents saltwater recreational anglers, beach goers, environmental advocates, and the public including many Virginia residents working to protect public access and ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore (CHNS).  
? In review of the draft options in the DEIS, VCAN cannot support any of the alternatives as they are all flawed in diminishing the visitor experience and not recognizing the socioeconomic and cultural resource impacts.  
? Our non-profit also supports the hard work by and position of the Hatteras Coalition in their fight to restore public access to the beaches of Cape Hatteras.  
? Everyone needs to remember, first and foremost, that CHNS is a National Seashore (or Park) not a National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) like Pea Island NWR imbedded in CHNS or our own Back Bay NWR here in Virginia Beach. At a NWR the wildlife comes first, public access and use second. At a National Park or Seashore public access and use comes first and wildlife second. That is not to say and/or ignore the fact that we are all stewards of these natural resources including the habitat and wildlife at Hatteras. The greatest conservationists, environmental stewards, and guardians of Hatteras are the people who rely on and access it the most ? be it for commercial, residential, or recreational reasons.  
? No real scientific data demonstrates any loss of critical habitat or wildlife from normal ORV use at CHNS. A prime example being that Hatteras is at the southern end of the piping plover's range and the documented population trends including plover population decreases correlate better to hurricanes, Nor'easters, and habitat destruction due to storm damage and NOT ORV use of the beach.  
? Remember also that Hatteras natives, North Carolinians, and the public were utilizing motorized vehicles on the Outer Banks before the establishment of CHNS in 1953, Nixon's 1972 for ORV management plans, and the current legal ORV and access condition brought about from the Hatteras consent decree which inherently violates the cultural heritage that is Hatteras.  
? We have all lost too much public access to our Nation's coastal waters from both the extremes, private developers and environmental zealots, to accept anymore. The nation's first national seashore was meant for the people. Let's keep it that way.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8554    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Zeilenga, Jack  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:05:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8555    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, Mr and Mrs James  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:05:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off-road vehicles don't belong on beaches--jus human and non-human animals do!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8556    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McCartin, Mike W  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:06:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8557    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:06:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We don't need to expose our national parkways to more abuse from motorized vehicles. Please vote against any relaxation of current rules prohibiting off road motor vehicles on the Cape Hattaras Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8558    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:06:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please STOP the plan to allow The National Park Service (NPS) to approve an Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Any extended used of ORV will be at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors. Please encourage NPCA to create an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds. In light of the oil spill in the Gulf, our wildlife areas in other regions are even more critical to be preserved. Thank you, Joanne Burns  
a Shoreline lover

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8559    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:06:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with

its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8560    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Davis, William J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:06:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep ORVs away from Cape Hatteras national seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8561    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:06:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly object to allowing off-road vehicles onto public lands to mar the beauty of our National Lands. Please do all you can to preserve all Public lands to foot traffic and vehicles to paved surfaces.  
I cringe when I see the damage done by mountain bikes and dirt bikes in our park lands.  
Please limit their use to private property. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8562    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:07:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe that to allow more time for ORV's to access the CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE would be a grave error. The noise, air pollution as well as the damage to the soil and sand that is already delicate would be a significant mistake. I have been fortunate to have visited this area many times as my parents lived near by and I would hope that future generations would be able to enjoy the pristine environment that I experienced. I realize that this may not be what the ORV proponents want but the damage that is done by the vehicles can be seen by what has happened to areas on the west coast that have allowed this to occur. Please do not enact this change in your policy !

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8563    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gross, Gary  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Public Comments on the DEIS By Gary Gross  
Following are written copies of the comments made by Gary Gross during the five public hearings on the DEIS.  
? Ocracoke ? Buxton ? Kill Devil Hills ? Raleigh ? Hampton  
Public Comments ? Ocracoke  
My name is Gary Gross  
I would like to begin by saying that this hearing on Ocracoke should have been held in the evening. It is unfair to ask the people of Hyde County to miss work or abandon their businesses to attend this important public hearing.  
In fact, the ferry from Swan Quarter does not even leave until 10 o'clock, making it virtually impossible for people on the mainland to participate in these hearings about their future.  
The timing of this hearing prevented the maximum level of participation from Hyde County citizens.  
Today, I would like to comment on how turtles are managed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.  
I believe endangered sea turtles would benefit from more proactive management practices that are now in use in other places, including other federal facilities.  
With more proactive management, including nest relocation, a better rate of nesting success can be achieved.  
It must always be remembered that the true measure of turtle management success, is not the number of nests in a given area, but the number that successfully hatch.  
Here are the facts as to why the DEIS should be modified in its final form to include more proactive nest relocation ?  
? The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations I the southeast. In this area, it is weather and predation that represents the greatest threat to sea turtles. Not people, not night driving. In fact, people on the beach at night will help reduce predators. ? The loggerhead Recovery Plan has historically recognized relocation as a regular conservation practice. ? Meanwhile, the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission recommends relocation only as "last resort," preferring a philosophy that lets nature take its course. ? In page 125 of the DEIS, the National Park Service relies upon the approach used by North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, which allows nest relocation only for those under imminent threat. ? This contradicts the practice done by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in the Pea Island Wildlife Refuge on the north end of Hatteras Island. ? By not supporting nest relocation, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area has lost over 46% of the nests laid in the last 11 years. ? Meanwhile, neighboring South Carolina in 2009, relocated 40% of its nests, which resulted in an incredibly low rate of lost nests of only 7.7%. This makes a compelling case for proactive nest relocation.  
The turtle management practices outlined in the DEIS pages 125 and 392 to 396 should be modified to allow more pro-active nest relocation as a tool for species recovery.  
Public Comments ? Buxton  
My name is Gary Gross  
Tonight I would like to comment on the birds that are selected for protection in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.  
The Endangered Species Act requires protection for all endangered species. However, there is no requirement in the ESA that non-endangered species be afforded the same level of protection.



I believe the National Park Service should reevaluate the position they have taken in the DEIS in giving special protection for non-endangered bird species.

I am referring to the protection that is outlined in pages 121 to 127 of the DEIS, which gives birds that are not endangered, and not even threatened, the same level of protection, as if they were endangered. These include American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds. It was for these non-endangered birds, that Oregon Inlet and Cape Point were closed from March/April through late August of last year.

However, in the DEIS, these birds are given huge buffers, as if endangered. In fact, these birds are protected by the National Park Service only because they appear on a North Carolina list called "Species of Concern."

States, such as North Carolina have created these lists in order to designate certain species as worthy of special tracking and monitoring ? not to force the hand of federal agencies and require them to apply the maximum buffers that are reserved for truly endangered species.

The National Park Service should reevaluate its position regarding buffers for these birds when preparing their final Environmental Impact Statement. According, pre-nesting closures are appropriate only for the threatened Piping Plover. Pre-nesting closures are unwarranted for American

Oystercatchers and Least Terns. And, because Colonial Waterbirds do not return to the same breeding site year after year, Pre-nesting closures for them are both unpredictable and unnecessary.

Furthermore, in counting birds in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, it is important that the Park Service get the benefit of considering all birds in the same ecosystem. That is why birds, of all species, on the dredge and spoil islands should be counted.

For example, on Cora June Island, just 500 yards off the shores of Hatteras Village, there are large colonies of birds not counted by the National Park Service.

Ignoring these birds distorts an accurate assessment of the effectiveness of resource management.

Making these changes in Alternative F would ? ? Benefit the long range success of wildlife ? Enhance the visitor experience ? Improve the lives of those who depend on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area

Public Comments ? Kill Devil Hills

My name is Gary Gross

In other hearings I've addressed key items outlined in the DEIS. Tonight, I would like to start at the very beginning. I respectfully submit that there is something flawed about the document before we even open it and try to study its 810 pages.

The flaw that I am referring to, is the cover of the DEIS. The photos selected by the National Park Service for the cover, distorts the true visitor experience.

The cover mistakenly creates the impression that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is only for fishing. It also creates the false impression that the seashore is only for men. This distortion creates an incorrect stereotype that the special interest groups love to exploit, saying that this whole thing is about a bunch of guys, in trucks, who just wanna go fishing. Nothing could be further from the truth.

While both commercial and recreational fishing play a vital role in the seashore, it is only one of many activities in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

Others include surfing, kiteboarding, and other water sports, swimming, sunbathing, shell collecting, horseback riding, bird watching, walking, and many other forms of family recreation.

Understanding this recreational diversity is fundamental to appreciating the need everyone has for beach access.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is well known as a wholesome, family-oriented destination. Accordingly, our visitors represent a broad cross section of humanity. On any given day, you will see not just men, but women and families with children enjoying recreation together.

Another distortion on the cover involves the photo showing vehicles crammed into one portion of the seashore. This is not representative of the visitor experience and sends a false statement that the issue is about ORV access. It is not. This issue is about beach access for everyone including the special needs of the many disabled and chronically ill visitors to our seashore.

Unfortunately, the cover sets the theme for other distortions that are contained in the document itself. For example, the excessive 1,000 meter closures outlined on DEIS pages 121 to 127.

The DEIS does not reflect the diversity that is the true visitor experience for people of all ages, races, and cultures who depend upon the promises I the enabling legislation that guaranteed recreation access for everyone.

Public Comments ? Raleigh

My name is Gary Gross

Tonight I would like to set the record straight about something said yesterday at the Kill Devil Hills hearing that goes to the core of really understanding the routes and areas designated in the DEIS.

An SELC spokesperson said, and I quote: the "Preferred alternative, from the way we counted it, looks like it preserves 52 miles of the seashores 68 total miles as accessible to ORV's, at least some portion of the year. That only leaves 16 miles that are accessible only to pedestrians. That doesn't strike us as fair." Listen to this part, "We would like to see equal access for pedestrian users of the beach as well as ORV users."

This is a very clever. It is like the shell game, at a carnival, where the fast talker gets the audience all twisted up and confused, so you can't follow the action. Let's slow it down and look at the facts:

According to the Park Service chart on DEIS page 101 ?

29 miles are classified as open year round to ORV's. That means it is designated as an ORV "route" with theoretical access, not guaranteed access. It can be shut down at a moment's notice for any breeding or nesting behavior.

Last year for example, during the important July 4th weekend, only 21 miles were actually open, not 29 and certainly not 52. And, those open areas did not include access to Oregon Inlet and Cape Point and other key areas that may have been technically open, but with no way to get there. Think of it this way ? It's like saying Yellowstone Park is open, but failing to mention that the area around old faithful is closed. A visitor to that Park would return home with a very bad experience.

Also, on July 4th, Compared to the 21 miles of ORV access, there were actually 26 miles of Pedestrian Only access, plus 6 miles of limited pedestrian access. This proves there is not the imbalance between ORV and pedestrian access that SELC would have you believe.

And in alternative D, the one they prefer, get this there would be 27 miles open for ORV and 40 miles of pedestrian only. Is this the equal access they talked about last night?

No, it's all part of the shell game that I am confident the Park Service and the public will have the wisdom to discern.

Public Comments ? Hampton

My name is Gary Gross.

Tonight, at this final public hearing, I would like to thank you Mr. Superintendent to for the way these meetings have been conducted and the opportunity you have given us to speak.

I have heard many people talk from the heart, about the importance of preserving beach access. Their message has been clear and consistent about what they want you to change or add to Alternative F.

The people ? want protection of resources, but ask you to base it on peer-reviewed science with reasonable buffers.

The people ? want you to have the flexibility to establish common sense corridors throughout the seashore that would provide access without harming wildlife.

The people ? want you to re-consider the economic impact. Government did not do a very good job on the socioeconomic section of the DEIS.

They farmed-out a bunch of it outside contractors, rather than connect with the community and find out for themselves. At best, the economic impact section is superficial and incomplete. It was not well done.

I say that not to criticize, but to remind you that it can be fixed. Please listen to the people, and make the critical changes to Alternative F that you have heard over and over again from the heart of the people.

During these hearings, along with you, I've listened to the razzel-dazzle from SELC. They said, "We've looked at the 5 other National Seashores on the Atlantic Coast that have ORV Plans. There's 150 miles in those seashores, they allow ORV use on 26 miles, NOT TRUE. On just the Padre Island National Seashore, 63.5 of its 70 miles are open to Beach driving year round. In Kill Devil Hills, I heard SELC say, quote, "They would like to see equal access for pedestrian users of the beach as well as ORV users."

Then, last night in Raleigh, we both heard them talk out of the other side of their mouth saying, "We believe a true no-action alternative would look at

no driving on the seashore and that would be the proper environmental baseline."

Their message, changes like the tides at the seashore. But, for the people, you have heard one consistent theme: protect resources, balance it with reasonable access, and reconsider the economic impact. Tonight we look to you as the Superintendent. You're the one we look to, to guide this thing through the rest of the federal process and have it come out later this year in a way that properly balances resource protection with reasonable recreation access.

Mr. Superintendent, we are entrusting our future to you, please do the right thing. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8564    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
I submit the above to you as an informed citizen who is greatly concerned about our coastlines and other environments. I hope you will rule on the side of true conservation, and minimize the area and use of off-road vehicles at a time when sea life will need more protection than ever, not less.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8565    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:07:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sirs: The notion that off-road vehicles would even be considered on our beaches anywhere is sadly irresponsible. By now, we all realize the critical natural balance required for our seashore habitats. If there is anyone who cares about Cape Hatteras, future generations, or the health of our earth in general on this project committee, they will not allow such an inappropriate activity on any shores.  
Sincerely, Mary Hillberg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8566    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:08:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8567    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:08:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason. "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8568	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:08:47						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Keep motorized vehicles off of public beaches!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8569	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Kopeck, Patricia						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:08:57						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We are a family that started visiting the Outer Banks, particularly Ocracoke in 1982, when our son was just 2 months old. We have seen changes, but this is the worst. Humans and wildlife and have lived in harmony for hundreds of years. You cannot punish all of society that is respectful to wildlife because of the few that are a-holes. We all understand that we have endangered species, but what we need is more education. The fishing license money should be going towards more education. You are hurting the economy of the small storekeepers and lodging owners that need us to make it through the winter months. Our family, our childrens family and I'm sure many others will always vacation on Ocracoke. Please come to a resolution and keep the beaches open.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8570	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:08:58						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	You need to protect the habitats in this area, and not allow ORV users to destroy them. There is no good reason why people need to drive along beaches in vehicles which spew far more emissions than regular cars. Walking is fine, much more peaceful, and better for the environment. Furthermore, the ORV users are a big disturbance not only to the wildlife, but to other people wanting to enjoy the peace and quiet of the beach as well.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8571	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Mr. Mike Murray, Supt. Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Supt. Murray: Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have however, reviewed the 77-page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rulemaking process, and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Sincerely Virginia M. Pitt Richmond, Virginia/Frisco NC						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8572	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:09:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason. "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8573	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Aronson, Sylvia A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:09:24						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						

**Correspondence:** People enjoy picnics and recreation on the beach. Beaches are for surfing, building sandcastles, looking for seashells, watching the birds, and playing in the water. These are all activities that do not require all terrain vehicles. Is there no place we will be able to take our children and our grandchildren without having to watch for traffic and having to listen to it's constant noise? Isn't it enough that we have to worry about armed individuals with loaded guns in our National Parks?  
Parks are for people to relax and enjoy nature. Please keep them that way.

**Correspondence ID:** 8574      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

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

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:09:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8575      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

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

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

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Keep pristine lands out of the hands of off-roaders. There is no need to open these areas up to damaging and detracting vehicles.

**Correspondence ID:** 8576      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Johnson, Elaine

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:09:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,

Elaine Johnson NPCA Trustee

**Correspondence ID:** 8577      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596      **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:09:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I recently visited the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and had a very enjoyable time without hearing a single ORV. I hope that I would never have to hear or see one. These are fragile ecosystems. We are destroying the earth with the simple use of internal combustion engines. We do not need to add the additional destruction of killing birds and turtles.  
Please get rid of ALL ORV use.

**Correspondence ID:** 8578      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Cooper, Ken

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:10:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support alternative D, keep ORVs out and off the seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 8579    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lam, Julie  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:10:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** National Parks are kept national for a reason - they are pristine places of enjoyment for people, as well as habitats and homes for the protected animals that dwell and live there. With all the natural land that we're losing to development, let's not let another beautiful area be destroyed by human greed and consumption.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8580    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Watts, Elizabeth  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:10:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8581    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ryan, George E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:10:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
George E. Ryan Old Lyme, Connecticut

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8582    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

It seems to me that humans can more easily adapt their use of the park to meet the needs of the animals than vice versa. Why can't we work to accommodate the wildlife that need our support? Please protect the birds, turtles, and plants that can't defend themselves. If we don't, what will happen to them?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8583    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:10:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8584    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** While I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore, it really shouldn't be necessary. The National Park Service is legally obliged to protect Federally Endangered Species, and this needs to be done immediately. In view of the increasingly disastrous oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, and the impact it is having on our wildlife, urgent action is required. This spill may also affect the Mid-Atlantic Seaboard, and our native species. Planning for this disaster should start with the protection of our wildlife now.  
Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8585    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:10:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8586    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:10:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8587    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8588    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8589    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I visit the Outer Banks of North Carolina each year and see very clearly the need to limit the impact that expanding human population and use are having on the wildlife that live and visit the beaches.  
Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses

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

If the park chooses not to enact Alternative D, if modified, the following are critical steps that should be addressed in the park's 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 (34 miles) should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

Thank you for taking the time to review these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8590    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
**Provide Equal Access for All Visitors:** Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
**Put Natural Resources First:** Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
**Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery:** A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8591    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
**Provide Equal Access for All Visitors:** Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
**Put Natural Resources First:** Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
**Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery:** A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8592    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
**Provide Equal Access for All Visitors:** Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
**Put Natural Resources First:** Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent



0011226

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8593    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8594    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Crabill, Phillip J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Trashing the environment for the fun of it is stupid and hideous!! Future generations will inherit the world we leave them. Don't let them inherit a disgusting and unusable mess!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8595    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8596    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, we support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to us.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8597    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8598    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8599    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8600    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8601    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8602    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8603    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

0011229

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8604    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow OTV use on this road. They are much too noisy and invasive. Nellie Israel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8605    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:11:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8606    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gordon, Marvene A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore has been a special place for me, and members of my family, for over 50 years. I was stationed at Fort Story, Virginia, in the late 1950's and early 1960's. Over the years I have watched as more and more beach areas are built up. Usually, the intent is good. But the end result is almost always overcrowding, and overuse. We have little natural seashore left. Please protect what we have left.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Marvene A. Gordon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8607    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a concerned citizen and longtime visitor to North Carolina's outer banks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many

other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches.

My first visit to the Outer Banks was in 1979. I well remember the abundant wildlife, dolphins playing in the surf, and the wild and beautiful quality of the environment there. Since then, much building and development has happened, but it has been handled such that a visitor would still be aware of the unique atmosphere of the region.

All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Ellen O'Donnell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8608    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Connie A. Newman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8609    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Krakow, Jessica  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8610    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Blessing, Bill  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Bill Blessing

**Correspondence ID:** 8611    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:12:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As someone who cares deeply about our planet and as a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8612    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a strong supporter and frequent visitor of America's National Parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches, as do I.

I feel that all of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is highly unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness quality of the seashore, and the numerous birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, but ONLY if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over the ORV form of recreation, and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." ORV use does NOT achieve this mandated goal!

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not the ORV user. In order to meet that specified intent of Congress it is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use if and ONLY if it can occur without harming wilderness qualities of the Seashore and its associated wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

In sum, continued ORV use of Cape Hatteras must be limited to those areas and those areas ONLY where such use is compatible to the intent of Congress and the purpose of the National Seashore's wilderness experience. ORV use destroys the latter and harms the wildlife and plant associations for which the Seashore is crucial.

**Correspondence ID:** 8613    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Miller, Marilyn  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:13:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This Must NOT HAPPEN!!!

**Correspondence ID:** 8614    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hunsberger, Barbara  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
 Barbara Hunsberger

**Correspondence ID:** 8615    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Watson, Jennifer L  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I beg you not to allow ORV traffic on the beaches of OUR Cape Hatteras National Seashore!!! Please Please Please do not allow this unbalanced use of our beloved Cape Hatteras be ruined by vehicular traffic. We must protect the wildlife, the pedestrians, and the overall visitor experience of a wonderful natural beach!

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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!

Jennifer Watson Frequent visitor to this wonderful Atlantic seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 8616    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 14:13:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8617    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:13:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 8618    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:13:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 8619    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:13:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Here in Arkansas we had a similar issue of ORVs damaging sensitive environmental areas in Ouachita National Forest. The National Forest made the right move when they released a management plan restricting ORV use in many areas, thus fulfilling their mission and protecting the forest and its natural resources for everybody in the long term, not just a single user group. Please follow their example.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 8620    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:13:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8621    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:13:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8622    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:13:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8623    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:13:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8624    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

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

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8625    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

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

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8626    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

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

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8627    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

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

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8628    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:14:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8629    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

I live on the north coast of California near Fort Bragg. When we allowed off road vehicles on our ten miles of dunes and beaches everything suffered! Birds, beasts and humans. These off road vehicles are destructive in the extreme. Now that they are no longer allowed the beaches and dunes are, for the most part, serene. (Except for those that trespass in their vehicles.) This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8630    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:14:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8631    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

Cape Hatteras is part of our NATIONAL park system, and as such all Americans have an obligation to see it protected. I have visited the park and it is a wonderful resource for all.

It needs to be well managed using scientific data and investigation. Between 1997 and 2007, we saw an 87% decline in the number of colonial waterbirds nesting at Cape Hatteras. The number rebounded between 2007 and 2009 under sound management, as did the number of sea turtle nests from 82 - 103 in the same period.

Let's work with all parties to establish goals that put wildlife first at this precious site.

Thank you very much.

**Correspondence ID:** 8632    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:14:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8633    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:14:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8634    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:14:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8635    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:14:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow the vehicles to be permitted on the beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8636    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:14:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8637    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:14:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Why in the name of all that is logical would you even CONSIDER allowing Off Road Vehicles on the Cape Hatteras Beaches? Just ask Park Rangers: the drivers of these things are obnoxious, often drunk or too young to be driving an auto (so why are they driving at all?) careless, destructive, rude, and contribute to, are involved in, or are directly responsible for the vast majority of vehicle accidents in the National Park system. Hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars are spent every year dealing with the destruction they cause and rescuing the drivers from the accidents they cause. I have watched them deliberately run over nesting birds, chase wildlife, and spook horses being ridden by responsible part visitors. I have watched them get drunk, then try some stupid "XTREME!" stunt that caused injury or death to themselves or others. And that does not even get into the fact that most of us go to a park to GET AWAY from exhaust, noise, and these same yahoos. There are millions of miles of trails on private lands for them to run their machines on. If they want to tear up the countryside, let them go THERE and leave the wilderness for those of us who don't want to see them.

**Correspondence ID:** 8638    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:14:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8639    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:15:17

**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:** 8640    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:15:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8641    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:15:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in total agreement with the recommendation that NO MOTORIZED VEHICLES be allowed on the beach, in the interest of the preservation of wildlife, both resident and seasonal, and the enjoyment of a quiet beach. The only crashing should be the waves on a windy day. The only wheels allowed those on baby strollers pushed by parents taking long walks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8642    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Getty, Ann  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:15:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8643    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Davison, Amber S  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Save Cape Hatteras!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8644    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:15:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of

0011241

the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8645    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:15:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** You must consider the wildlife in the area when fashioning an ORV policy. The traffic precluded not only the abundant wildlife that needs to exist but also the use by pedestrians and families.  
Stop, or significantly curtail the ORV traffic in the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8646    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:16:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not let off road vehicles on the beach. They destroy beauty and habitats for a few thrill seekers to have fun.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8647    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:16:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** these vehicles can do enormous damage.  
Please do not allow them on the beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8648    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:17:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep the Cape Hatteras National Seashore off limits to vehicles that would alter the face of the land or pose a threat to the wild life in the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8649    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kreuter, Q.  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:17:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There are enough places for ORV's already without giving them access to a place such as Hatteras. Who is paying you off!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8650    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Anderson, Carol W  
**Received:** May,03,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Buxton Point open even if we have to get there on the back roads. As long as we can get there.  
Carol Williams Anderson, Buxton Robin Anderson Rose (sp) Anderson Dick Anderson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8651    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Denney, David  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,  
David Denney

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8652    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596



**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:17:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep it pristine. It's a beach for heaven's sake, not a road.

**Correspondence ID:** 8653    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ahumada, Leo  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:18:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off road vehicles off the pristine beaches of Cape Hatteras. The Cape offers visitors a great place to enjoy the tranquil and serene beauty that Cape Hatteras is known for. Off road vehicles would destroy that tranquility and further pollute one of our most precious natural treasures that is renowned throughout the world. The quiet beauty of the place is one reason that my family and I visit there on our vacations.

**Correspondence ID:** 8654    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:18:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8655    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:18:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sincerely, Nicole Miani

**Correspondence ID:** 8656    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:18:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of

0011243

the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8657	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Livesay, Corinne B				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:19:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We've fought this same battle over AllTerrain vehicles in the Boundry Waters in MN, it's been an issue in Yellowstone, and in most National Parks in the country. ATVs are destructive to the environment and the ecosystem, very noisy, and ruin any outdoor spiritual experience people go to such places refreshment and solitude. It is also selfishness, to use the few pristine places left purely or entertainment. Is this really the world we want our children to inherit? With the Gulf Coast threatened with oil spills, and the necessity of conserving unnecessary uses of gasoline for energy independence, it makes sense to use ATVs for necessary purposes only.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8658	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:19:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Save Cape Hatteras from disruption and pollution of off road vehicles - let these lands remain undisturbed for all to enjoy!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8659	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Chipman, Eric H				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:19:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is important to keep our waterways clean, based on the example of what happened in the Gulf of Mexico. WE OWE THIS TO OUR CHILDREN!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8660	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, Below is a form letter, whose contents I endorse, but which I did not compose myself. I would like to add to it that I have enjoyed the quiet and wildness of the Outer Banks seashore for almost 50 years. Alas, during those years, it has gradually become invested with more and more vehicular traffic, on the very beaches themselves. Don't let this new invasion take place! Have some respect for the wildlife there, and the beauty of the beaches' emptiness. Please! Now to the form letter: As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8661	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Guttenberg, Marta				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:19:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please, no recreation vehicles on Cape Hatteras.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8662	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Pearce, J B				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:20:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Off-road vehicles have a special ability to disrupt the peace and quiet of a seashore, and rob visitors of the enjoyment of the surroundings. Many, probably most, people seek out these areas as places for relaxation - and escape from the racket of everyday life. It boils down to whether a smaller group of self-centered enthusiasts has any automatic right to alter recreation that the rest of us seek with respect and appreciation for its uniqueness .				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8663	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft						

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8664    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:21:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I simply can't imagine the devastation that will occur if OVR are allowed on the National Shoreline. Generally, those vehicles are destructive and noisy. The reason I have visited the National Shoreline is for the peaceful environment and the beautiful shoreline...which would be spoiled for true nature lovers if OVRs are allowed to endanger the wildlife that lives in the sands of the shoreline and the peace of the visitors. I hate even the thought of such a thoughtless thing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8665    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, Caitlin  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:21:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think that this could damage the National Park. I think this wonderful place should be free from off road vehicles and things like that. I do not like this idea.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8666    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Low, Sammy  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:21:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8667    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:22:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,  
Sam Sloneker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8668    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bedell, David  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:22:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Pedestrians and wildlife should be given priority consideration over ORVs since ORV use is highly destructive of habitat and consequently destructive of wildlife. Human pedestrian traffic is not nearly so destructive and should be encouraged, though it too should be curbed or restricted when necessary to preserving wildlife and its habitat.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8669    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:22:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sincerely, Lisa Mo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8670    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:22:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Cathleen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8671    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Our environment is already in peril and now we must do all we can to protect the vulnerable wildlife from perishing. I believe small steps that we humans do can have such a big impact on our future generation and the future of our planet and ALL its inhabitants. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8672    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Rainey, Dorli  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:23:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Beaches and motorized vehicles do not mix well. The destruction of beaches by motorized vehicles is a fact of life and has to be stopped to prevent

erosion, killing of wildlife and preserving a quality of life we enjoy when we go to the beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8673    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:23:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I so appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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 Jeff Lewis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8674    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:23:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** cape hatteras is a special and wild place, and needs to be protected from off road atv's and other motorized vehicles. thanks so much for your support.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8675    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:23:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i hope that our elected officials and the concerned federal bureaucracy will act more responsibly concerning noise pollution in our national parks. the parks are pristine lands that are to be protected, preserved and available for communing with nature. allowing atvs etc. into our parks is not a good thing and should be either prohibited or sharply curtailed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8676    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Rubio, Mike  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:23:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** People using off road vehicles should have the right to use some of our land resources. But their use and it's effects must take into account it's effects on the rest of us, such as noise pollution, assaulting smells and an energy level not conducive to growing things and people out to enjoy mother-nature as it is.  
Please ensure that the majority of the coast line here is saved for the "naturists" as that would be the only fair division of the space.  
Thank you,  
Mike Rubio

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8677    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:23:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8678    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:23:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We need to keep at least some of our Public Lands free from modern human conveniences and toys. Let Nature look and be like it is without human "improvements".

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8679    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:24:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am writing as a very concerned citizen, as a member of the National Parks Conservation Association, and as 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. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8680    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Ellis, Dale H  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:24:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8681    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:24:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As we learned the hard way here in Missouri, off-road vehicles and all-terrain vehicles can ruin the experience of nature for everyone who isn't riding one. The noise can be heard for long distances, even when the vehicles themselves are out of sight. Oil and fuel spills have damaged Ozark streams where ORV trails cross them -- and riders at Hatteras will be just as tempted to splash through the shallows. Once allowed into the National Seashore area it will be impossible to police the behavior of ORV riders. The minority of those who insist on ORV use should not be permitted to ride over the rest of us!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8682    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:24:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** please do not allow any additional use of motor vehicles on outer bank beaches

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8683    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, Geoffrey  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:24:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do your part to protect the nesting sites of sea turtles from destruction. This includes opening critical habitats to off-road vehicle use. I'm an off-roader, but do it with respect for the environs and species that it effects. Thankyou very kindly for your cooperation.

**Correspondence ID:** 8684    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:24:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Don't spoil tourism.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8685    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
Thank you for this opportunity to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore, an area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. However, it appears that all of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors, an approach that is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. For too many years, the interests of ORV groups, which represent just a small, but very vocal, percentage of Cape Hatteras visitors, have outweighed the interests of the two million people that visit this dynamic seashore every year. But people all over the country support management at their national parks that balances recreation and wildlife protections over the demands of one special interest group. The lack of an effective vehicle management plan at the Seashore contributed to an 84% decline in the number of colonial waterbirds (birds that nest in a group) breeding at the Seashore between 1997 and 2007. A recent change in management at the Seashore demonstrates that, given a chance, wildlife can rebound. Under a new science-based management plan, the number of nests laid by colonial waterbirds more than doubled in 2009 compared to 2007. And the two years under the new plan have seen a record 112 sea turtle nests in 2008 and 103 nests in 2009, compared to 82 in the 2007 season prior to the implementation of the plan. In the draft, the best of the alternatives is the "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, provided it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends and to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. 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. Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8686    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:25:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I urge you, sir(s), to PLEASE NOT ALLOW off road vehicle traffic to invade Cape Hatteras beaches, where delicate and fragile wildlife and natural features will be threatened! Haven't we done enough damage to our fragile environment? PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS KIND OF THREAT TO INVADE OUR PRECIOUS BEACHES BY MAKING A MODIFIED ALTERNATIVE D OF THE ORV MANAGEMENT PLAN (EIS) ASAP BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE! I appreciate your undivided attention to this crucial issue! Thank you for your time!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8687    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:25:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please reconsider allowing vehicle traffic on Cape Hatteras beaches. My family has vacationed there often. We would think twice about going to a natural setting like Cape Hatteras and seeing vehicles driving on the beach. I think people have done enough damage already. Please keep the Cape's beaches vehicle free.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8688    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:26:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Families and birders have come for years to these underdeveloped and unspoiled beaches for the wildlife. The noise, trash and damage off road vehicles can do is detrimental to this pristine and fragile environment. The NPS has a responsibility to protect this area from harm and protects it's seabirds, turtles and other wildlife. ORV use on Cape Hatteras National seashore should only occur if it does not endanger wilderness and wildlife resources.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8689    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Millet, Saralaine  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. Growing up on the east coast I cherished this area and its undeveloped beaches during family vacations. Unfortunately all of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I'm confident that if you saw what ORVs have done to the Algodones Dunes in California you would want to minimize ORV use of Hatteras beaches. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8690	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:26:36						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	If we dont take care of this earth, who will? The people that have the power to do something meaningful should and must do something to keeps things the way they are, not destroy them.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8691	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Griffin, James V						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p> <p>Sincerely, James Griffin</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8692	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:26:43						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8693	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:26:56						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Pristine areas can never be brought back to their original condition. We as human beings need quiet and natural areas. Let's be responsible human beings.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8694	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would like to 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 cherished by many who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact						



statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors and fails to conserve and protect wildlife. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, but only if 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.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8695    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Basnar, Lee  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely, Lee Basnar

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8696    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:27:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Thank you for your time and service.  
Jay Holmes New York, NY

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8697    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:27:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow ORV onto the Cape Hatteras Seashore. This would totally ruin the tranquility of the beach for all people, and would irrevocably disturb the wildlife and environmental balance. The rights of some to drive their off road vehicles everywhere do not weigh more than the rights of all to enjoy the beach in peace -- including the wildlife!  
THANK YOU VERY MUCH

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8698    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Sincerely, Emil Scheller

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8699      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** George, Marvin I  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:28:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8700      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596      **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:28:17

**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:** 8701      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Knotts, Timothy A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:28:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8702    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:28:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't open it up to off road vehicles. It will ruin it!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8703    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Beringer, Ted M  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:29:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow ORVs to drive on the beaches at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Are you going to destroy every last natural area in the United State so that manufacturers of ORVs can make a buck off of the deal. I don't want to smell ORV exhaust or have to avoid getting hit by one of these vehicles when I visit our country's national sea shores. Nor do I want to see wildlife habitat destroyed just so some uneducated lazy people can gain access to the beach. Let them drive their ORVs some where else. Everywhere ORVs have been allowed, the terrains has become degraded over time. You should see what they are doing to the state parks in Missouri where there aren't enough people to police the parks. Honestly, I wonder what you people are thinking.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8704    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:29:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8705    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:29:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8706	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:29:31						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The mere idea of management of noise and pollution in an area designated a primitive wilderness is beyond any rational understanding. Stop caving to the loudest...in more ways than one...and listen to your own good sense. Keep Off Road vehicles out of our wilderness areas. Their use in these areas cannot occur without damage to wildlife and the environment.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8707	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:29:39						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8708	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Loughmiller, Karen H.						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:29:48						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, Please support modified alternative D of teh draft Environmental Impact Statement with regard to Off Road Vehicle policy at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I urge you to place greatest emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, and especially protection of endangered sea turtles and shore birds. In addition, as the world faces declining supplies of oil, and ever greater risks in attempting to retrieve what remains, it is imperative for us to eliminate the use of gasoline engines and transition as quickly as possible to other means of transportation and other sources of fuel. One small step in that direction would be to severely limit the recreational use of such vehicles in protected natural areas like Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We need to do all we can to preserve the natural quiet of this preistine seashore. Sincerely, Karen H. Loughmiller Asheville, NC						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8709	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:29:57						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Too much precious land is being taken over for human entertainment. Wildlife and flora are being sacrificed on the altar of personal, sensual satisfaction. Our shorelines must be preserved for the concerned walkers and wild beings that need to protected from man's greed.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8710	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:30:01						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would encourage the NPS to pursue an action vs. a no-action alternative. I support elements such as: ? Officially designating ORV routes and areas ? Limiting ORV use in locations without sensitive resources or high pedestrian use ? Designating year-round non-ORV areas ? Including "species management areas" (SMAs) ? Establishing "Desired Future Conditions" as well as a system for periodic review and adaptive management initiatives ? Restricting night-driving from May 1 through November 15 during turtle nesting season ? Requiring ORV permits for a fee and with an education requirement ? Addressing Overcrowding I would support additional pedestrian access including consideration of construction of two pedestrian access trails. I would encourage taking steps that would be beneficial to birds and other wildlife and would seek to minimize adverse impacts. I would encourage "noise free" periods for visitors. I enjoy the sound of the ocean at the beach, not motors. Thank you for your consideration.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8711	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Klosterman, Jeff A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:30:13						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not let Off Road Vehicles (OVRs) in the National Seashore at the Outer Banks of North Carolina. It will ruin both the flora and the fauna of that area. Let them drive like idiots somewhere else. Thanks.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8712	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. I love Off-Roading as much as the next person, but I am a realist and that means that I am aware that there are people who just don't follow the rules and their behavior is less than sober! You do not have the man-power nor the funds to do the monitoring that would be necessary to keep everyone safe, people and animal. Beach goers do not enjoy having sand flung in their faces at all and the tires on the Off-Road vehicles fling a lot of sand! Given the financial status of the park system today, I do not think that this is appropriate because, again, the manpower to monitor the safety of both the off-roader and the beach goer isn't there. Plus, from what I have seen, heard, and read, the park services are being cut! Even at the best of times, this is a really bad idea. I just don't see how it can be justified given the economic realities of today. The damage that these vehicles do to the environment and to nesting wildlife is irreparable.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8713    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Berryhill, Jr., William I  
**Received:** May,03,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** After studying your DEIS as carefully as I can (it was huge by the way), I have decided that the plan I like the best is the COALITION FOR BEACH ACCESS DEIS ASSESSMENT. This plan in its entirety best represents the presiding will of the taxpayers (CHNS users) as well as the invaluable wildlife deserving public protection. Adoption of this plan would solve all of your problems with effective Seashore management and would be a boon to your administration as Superintendent.  
 One other point I would like to make is from the law enforcement perspective. As a CHNS user for over forty years, I have spent many a day on the beach without a single sighting of a Park Ranger. This is not good. It's a glowing invitation for a minority of neer-do-wells to violate Park Service regulations.  
 My best advice is to throw the NPS DEIS out the window and replace it with the COALITION FOR BEACH ACCESS and to convince the U. S. Department of the Interior to hire more Park Rangers to enforce the regulations you already have on the books.  
 The above two steps would comprise your new DEIS in a manner inculcating overall public recreational acceptance and wildlife protection simultaneously.  
 It's time the National Park Service became neighbors of the citizens who pay its bills -- and not their enemy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8714    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Dahn, Rick D  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:30:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please limit Off Road Vehicle use on National Parkways and Parks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8715    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:30:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** please protect biodiversity rich natural areas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8716    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McKenna, Colleen  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. I spent a year living in North Carolina and was dismayed at the prevalence of motorized vehicles on beaches. In my opinion, motorized vehicles of any kind should never be allowed on these fragile habitats, not to mention the annoyance factor!!! This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8717    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:31:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8718    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:31:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please understand what you are doing to the community, home owners and business owners before you pass this act. My family owns a house in Frisco, NC and in the past two years with the beach closings we have slowly watched stores, restaurants and other small businesses close due to the decline in vacationers because of the beach closings. I really do not understand your logic of ruining an entire community for a bird that is not even endangered. There are also acts in order to kill other animals on the island as well due to these birds.. what sense does that make? I really think everyone needs to take a long hard look at how many lives you would ruining by doing this, especially with the economy the way it is. Please think about people before the birds. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8719    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:31:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Do Not Open Cape Hatteras National Seashore up to Off-Road Vehicle Use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8720    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:31:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8721    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Miller, Russ + Judy  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:32:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:  
Please do not allow off-the road vehicles or any other vehicular travel on Cape Hatteras Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8722    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:32:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8723    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:32:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** ORV's should NOT be allowed ANYWHERE that they would disturb anything natural. Then they should only be allowed in parks specifically designed for ORV use. Environment, wildlife, noise and unspoiled beauty of the area should be the major factors in decisions where NOT to allow them.

**Correspondence ID:** 8724    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Demro, Rebecca  
**Received:** May,03,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras national Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
Mr. Murray, Currently there is a consent decree that restricts public access to prime locations in many parts of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Rec Area.  
I'm writing to you today because I support H.R. 718 and S. 1557 which reinstate the National Park Service "Interim on Management Strategy. I fully disagree on the idea of removing people from the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Rec. Area. There is no scientific evidence and I believe there is a way that we can coexist on the beaches as we have for years with all animal species! Thanks for your time, Rebecca Demro MECH VA.

**Correspondence ID:** 8725    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

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

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

**Correspondence ID:** 8726    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:32:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D,

if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely, J.A. Bergeron

**Correspondence ID:** 8727    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McCulloch, Jim  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:32:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,  
Jim McCulloch

**Correspondence ID:** 8728    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ford, Michael C  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Michael C. Ford

**Correspondence ID:** 8729    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:33:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I realize there are individuals who find recreation via off-roading, but I don't feel it's appropriate to allow them to do so in our national parklands.

These areas were set aside to be preserved for all to enjoy their beauty and complex ecosystems. Allowing these vehicles in will not only destroy areas of habitat and add air pollutants, but also add to levels noise pollution in the area. These effects will ruin the ecological assets of the area, as well as the ability for others to find the in wonder at this special place.

I strongly urge you to disallow or severely limit the access off road vehicles have to our national lands.



**Correspondence ID:** 8730    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.  
There is NO God-given right to ride an OTV/ATV anywhere and everywhere one pleases! Enough of our lands have been ruined by off-roading, ATV use, and road building! The wildlife is disturbed, the environment is disturbed, the peace and quiet is disturbed. Have you ever been out trying to enjoy the open spaces and had it ruined by the NOISE of OTV's?!!!! I ask of you to stand up to OTV/ATV industry and PROTECT the Outer Banks of North Carolina!!  
The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8731    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:33:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am sick and tired of seeing fine lands destroyed in the name of "progress". We must plan for not only humanities future but also for wildlife as well. Recreational land use planning must take this into account. Off-road vehicle users can find other lands to use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8732    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Sincerely,  
Janice A. Bergeron

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8733    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:33:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Reader:  
I am an Irish-American East End gang member in Seattle and run my gang with my friend Patrick, and our gang leaders, Ron, and Karen. We all live here. It is a gang from the older, poor part of London, England and has been recruiting non-violent whites in Boston, MA since probably the 1860s. We are proud to be non-racist and pro-homosexual Black Irish people and women have always been welcome. I also lead other non-violent gangs from that position. My Aunt is active in her Church with her friend Lili, who is a priest in the Cali Cartel in Colombia and in Mexico.  
We wanted you to know and I wanted you to know that seawalls used to frighten us; later, it was explained to us and to me that seawalls are what stops development from battering the land; not otherwise.  
We are glad that the U.S. people explained to us, to me, and "thank you" for the explanation.  
Sincerely, Mr. Dustin Collings May 7th, 2010

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8734    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Herndon, Laura  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:34:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8735    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:34:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. This way everyone will be able to enjoy this beautiful national treasure and it will prevent damage coming here that will ultimately be irreversible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8736    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to

submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8737    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Stahl, Charlotte  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:34:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Thank you,  
Charlotte

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8738	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:34:52						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."</p> <p>Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8739	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Benford, Al						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:34:54						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Vehicular traffic on Cape Hatteras must be strictly limited so pedestrians can enjoy the area without danger to their safety, and without intrusive noise.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8740	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:35:16						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."</p> <p>Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8741	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, Barbara						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p>						

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
- Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8742    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Griffin, John  
**Received:** May,03,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** John Griffin Salvo NC

Comments on CHNSRA Draft ORV Management Plan DEIS

We have reviewed the DEIS as well as the Coalition for Beach Access ORV Access Environmental Impact Position Statement and urge that the changes outlined in the Coalitions Position Statement be fully adopted in the FEIS.

Routes and Areas p.vi Conflicts between motorized and non motorized recreation users --NPS has never made public a list of reported incidents. -in 10 years, only a single minor incident involving a stuck vehicle and a pedestrian was disclosed. The driver was uncharged and determined to be not at fault P 1- NPS should acknowledge that Pea Island NWR is a prime, pedestrian only area for visitors to the seashore. This is 10+ miles of ORV free seashore on Hatteras Island.

P.210 protected species still at risk from pedestrians & ORV's even with resource closures in place -No Piping Plover deaths have ever been attributed to ORV's --ORV violations continue to decrease as signage & education improve -pedestrian violations are far more significant than ORV violations. P.xxiv carrying capacity for "peak use limit" determined universally based upon linear feet of beachfront. -no reason to restrict capacity on Bodie & Ocracoke rather than at Cape Point -fails to acknowledge that closures on Bodie Island Spit & Cape Point increased congestion at other areas (p265). - buffers & closures force folks into smaller areas resulting in increased resource impairment and diminished visitor experience. P. xix ORV offseason access on South facing Villages -Based upon seasonal visitor stats, Frisco, Hatteras, Ocracoke do not require ORV closure beyond the 5/15-9/15 closures for the other villages.

P. 1 ORV's providing primary and practical access for visitors -pedestrian only access are in opposition to ADA, small children, elderly, folks who need recreational equipment. P. 263 Alt F fails to deal with the need for a soundside access ramp on Bodie. Relocating ramp 2 = mile So is ill advised. Better to enlarge parking and add handicap ramp at R 1.

Closure Due to Birds p. 468 Restrictive SMA MLI is overly restrictive. Foot & ORV corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around, or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding & nesting season to maintain access. P. 468 Foot & ORV corridors should be provided as cited immediately above. P.121-127 --establish reasonable buffers to allow pass thru only corridors to ensure maintenance of access. --buffer for chicks should move not expand with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source. --Buffers should be reasonable based upon science and experience in other nesting areas PP breeding nesting 75-50m Unfledged chicks 200m WP breeding nesting 150-30 U C 30m AMOY 150-flush+15 UC flush +15 Least Tern 150-flush+15 UC 30 Other Colonial 200-30 UC 30

-124 Pro-Active Adaptive Mgmt -adopt initiatives as outlined in DEIS and review progress as needed- not ever 5 years. Acknowledge that human interference is a mere 3% of AMOY nest survival -consider neighbor locations (villages, dredge & spoil islands, Pea Island NWR) as the same eco system. Track & include bird activity in these adjacent areas in target productivity.

Closure Due to Turtles p.125 Night Driving Restrictions are unnecessary and overly restrictive. The following changes would adequately protect nesting turtles. -Closure to surf line from 1 hour before sunset until dawn monitored by Turtle Night Nest Watch Team. -Closure of 10 sq meters during daylight hours -Use of Pea Island Style keyhole pattern fence to surf line after dark. P.377 "Major Adverse" events (as defined by NPS p.369) have not occurred on our beaches -Nesting females have not been killed -Complete or partial nest loss due to human activity has not "occurred frequently" -Hatchling disorientation/disruption due to human activity has not "occurred frequently" -Direct hatchling mortality from human activity has not "occurred frequently" Pro-Active Turtle Night Nest Watch program would insure continued non impact of ORV's Adoption of more proactive techniques used at other East Coast locations would enhance turtle nesting success.

P. 392-396 NPS inadequately addresses environmental issues more detrimental to turtle recovery success than ORV's or pedestrians. -weather events lead to a 38.5% of nests with 0 hatchlings (p.87, p.219). -false crawl statistics do not support the theory that light pollution is a significant problem on our beaches (p. 125, p. 219) -predator management and nest enclosure practices encourage ghost crabs which are a primary predator of turtle eggs and hatchlings.

Using current NCWRC relocation guidelines our beaches and our state has lost 55% and 60% of Leatherback nests respectively over the past 10 years. Rather than continue these failed guidelines adopt what is working in other states. Instead, base nest relocation on "average high tide line".

Cultural/Historical Values As set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) the very purpose of the DEIS is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the decision making process. In the DEIS "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the 1st sentence on the 1st page, as well as numerous times thereafter in the "Purpose of the Plan" section. 2 paragraphs of the remaining 800+ page document is devoted to an analysis of cultural resources.

NPS guidelines require that Traditional Cultural designation by based on patterns of land use that reflect cultural traditions valued by long term residents of the local community. Further a landscape can also constitute Traditional Cultural Property if it is a place where a community has traditionally carried out economic or other cultural practices important in maintaining its historic identity.

The DEIS describes ORV access as historic (p.83) and as predating the Seashore and as being integral to the public use by residents and visitors. The document also lists commercial fishing (p.18), recreational fishing (p. 15 & 206), and general recreational activities (p. 259) as historic. These activities are featured on the front cover of the DEIS, but apparently ignored throughout the rest of the document.

Collectively these activities, along with social gatherings, weddings, funerals, represent an unbroken pattern of land use extending back many generations prior to the Seashore's establishment. The continuation of these patterns of use are central to maintaining the historic identity of these communities. NPS' failure to appropriately consider the cultural and historic value of surf zone access is a direct violation of its legal responsibility under Section 106 of the NEPA and the NEPA framework.

Socioeconomic Analysis

Socioeconomic data and analyses in the DEIS (pg. 270-281; 561-698) result in misleading and, at times, erroneous conclusions.

Region of Influence (ROI) -The ROI incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to CHNSRA. -Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact of Seashore Villages. -Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages is significantly downplayed.

Emphasis in the DEIS is on the ROI wide or County wide level impacts.

-The overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages. This is not addressed.

Incomplete Data on Visitation/Business Surveys

-Economic analyses in the DEIS do not use data from the 1st full year of the Consent Decree (2009).

-Many 2008 visitors were either unaware of the scope and breadth of Consent Decree beach closure, or had already made plans/reservations.

-Actual business survey data rather than model projections for economic impact for Seashore Villages businesses are not available in the DEIS.

Overall Visitor Counts Overall visitor counts include visitors to Ft Raleigh NHS and the Wright Bros NM.

-A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. -

Visitors patronizing Ft Raleigh & the Wright Bros who do not visit the actual Seashore need to be factored out of the count.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternate F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the high visitor season.

-Under Alternate F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closer based upon (inflated) buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree.

-Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Summary The above cited inaccuracies clearly understate the socioeconomic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses.

Other Areas of Interest Pet/Horse Restrictions Pets should be allowed on lease year round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs. NPS needs to consider why interfering with nature is ok sometimes but not others. The adaptive management decisions reflected in the DEIS show a clear bias to implement actions that will adversely affect the visitor experience but to avoid actions that would benefit both natural resources and visitors. -OK to replace South Point Wetlands with a parking area because beach will be closed to ORV's -OK to relocate turtle nests when storms are imminent, but not before -OK to set aside areas of beach to replant the "extirpated" seabeach amaranth, but not ok to clear vegetation at Cape Point Ponds to create more favorable plover habitat that isn't in the ORV corridor) -OK to kill predators (greatest risk to turtles & birds), not ok to drive on beach at night (deterrent to predators, low risk to turtles & birds)

Additional Considerations Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area are unique in the fact that folks live here. You categorize us as visitors but that misses the point that we live in the middle of you. That fact makes CHNSRA unique. We live in your park or your park is where we live. My guess is its America's park and you manage it and we live in it.

Don't let us down.

John Griffin Salvo, NC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8743 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Kiver, Eugene

**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." Overly destructive use of a national park resource such as motorized vehicles should not be permitted!

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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 quality of the visitor experience of being cognizant of the surrounding environment is greatly reduced when riding a motorized machine. Careful walking and observation of environmental details is the highest and best use of lands in our National parks and should be defended strongly by the stewards of the land.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Eugene Kiver

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8744 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Giese, Mark M

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:35:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8745 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Owens, Stephanie

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:35:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8746    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:**

private

**Received:**

May,07,2010 14:36:47

**Correspondence Type:**

Web Form

**Correspondence:**

To united States Congressmen and Women:

I strongly oppose off road vehicles in our national parks. Please enter a NO VOTE on this legislation.

Mrs. Suzanne Koenig

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8747    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:**

private

**Received:**

May,07,2010 14:37:04

**Correspondence Type:**

Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Our entire family (28 people) have been going to the Outer Banks and Cape Hatteras for the last 40 years.

We are VERY concerned about the fact that you are going to allow off road vehicles on the beaches. There are SO few places that are pristine and natural and you will destroy not only the beauty but the habitat as well.

In light of the current oil spill that we understand may make it's way up the eastern shores, PLEASE consider stopping this plan.

Thanks you, Kathy and Dr. Ray Vactor 724-935-8775

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8748    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:**

private

**Received:**

May,07,2010 14:37:06

**Correspondence Type:**

Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Recent events have pointed out the need for increased interest in stewardship of this earth. Please take our concerns for protecting our nation seriously.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8749    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:**

private

**Received:**

May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

Web Form

**Correspondence:**

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I have had the opportunity to visit this seashore on twice, and thoroughly enjoyed the experience, particularly the natural sounds of the ocean and the physical exhilaration of walking the beaches. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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.

Sincerely, Richard Jarvis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8750    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:**

private

**Received:**

May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with

its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

4) Americans are generally overweigh and unfit, causing greatly increased medical bills to all of us. Riding around on ORV's uses up fossil fuels, makes a lot of noise, tears up the terrain, and does neither the rider nor anybody else any health benefit. ORV's have no place in a primitive area, and they should be kept out permanently. If any vehicle is allowed, MTB's would be a much better choice in appropriate areas.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8751    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:37:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We don't need 4-Wheelers on the beach. I used to live in VA and NC and visited the Outer Banks often, so I don't want to see it ruined by a bunch of drunken OVC people who think just because they rent/own a place at the beach, it's theirs to do with as they please. Stop this law to allow driving on the beach to go into effect.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8752    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:37:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Enough is enough. Let's try to nature in nature and us polluters off shore. Diana Ross

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8753    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:37:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8754    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** unknown, unknown  
**Received:** May,03,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern, Please do not close the beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8755    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:38:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think that National Parks and National Seashores should be kept as close as possible to pristen/natural enviroment. Any Off Road vehicles will pollute the unique natural enviroment that God intended when allowed to pollute them with this type of activity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8756    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Latamore, George B  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:38:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My wife and I spend a week on the outer Banks every February and visit areas in the National Seashore for birding and hiking. These are ecologically and structurally fragile areas that can easily be damaged by too much traffic. Crabs' sea birds and their nesting sites and other creatures that live on or near the dunes and sea shore will be endangered by ORV traffic. Additionally, ORV traffic is detrimental to the the activities of birders and other pedestrian shore users and can put small children in danger. There are plenty of other areas including dirt roads where ORV users can play. Keep them off the beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8757    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Jones, Emily A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. Our family has spent many wonderful vacations on your beautiful undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. This fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Emily Jones

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8758    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:39:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8759    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Puel, Gloria J  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Big Oil's hold on this country, and the world must end. These companies are NOT in business to serve the public, they are motivated solely by greed and the thirst for power. They live in mansions, and on vast estates FAR AWAY from the filth their oil creates. In this world there are myriad alternative energy resources! Most as far cleaner, and much more plentiful than the black much Big Oil companies dredge up. The truth is, many of these resources can provide energy FREE OF CHARGE to consumers! This is what big oil DOES NOT WANT! If this beautiful planet of our is going to survive, we MUST devote all of our energy to finding and USING alternative energy resources, such as wind, hydro-electric, and solar! Polluters such as BP must be weighed down with such heavy fines, taxes, and fees, that even the tiniest spill will send them to bankruptcy! We CANNOT CONTINUE to bow down to Middle Eastern countries in order to obtain their oil. It's time they come begging to US. Let them keep their oil, and their terrorists. We can do better!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8760    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:39:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement



privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8761    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Magori, Krisztian  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:39:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Krisztian Magori

**Correspondence ID:** 8762    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:39:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This fragile eco system needs to be spared the onslaught of vehicular traffic. Please consider your responsibility to protect wildlife. Please !!

**Correspondence ID:** 8763    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:39:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Annah Gardner

**Correspondence ID:** 8764    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Johnston, Philip W  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:40:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with

its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8765    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Blevins, Terry  
**Received:** Apr,30,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I live in Buxton, North Carolina and I would like to briefly comment on two subjects that apply to me and my family in reference to the "DEIS" plan. The beach is our source of recreation. First: Without the use of an "ORV" it would be impossible for me, my wife and my two children one of which is only a toddler to have access to our beach. Pedestrian only areas discriminate against us and many others for various reasons. Secondly, the socioeconomic impact of the "DEIS plan impacts our family in a negative way. Both my wife and I work for a business that depends on tourism. Hatteras Island has some of the best surf fishing beaches in the world, that is why most visitors come here, and those are the visitors that support the business we work for. These are my concerns, and I hope for more consideration for not only myself, but also for the many visitors who come to enjoy our wonderful beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8766    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:40:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8767    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:40:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I urge you to create a plan the is eco-friendly and pedestrian friendly. ORV's should be limited to providing access to those who, due to disability or age induced limitation, would otherwise be unable to enjoy the benefits of the Park system. Once the park is destroyed by ORV traffic it will be too late and to costly to return the parks to the pristine places they were meant to be.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8768    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Stevens, Lisa  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:40:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I used to live in North Carolina and found the coastal area a marvel. Not only is each barrier island unique, the shoreline of the mainland is also quite a treasure. Please don't let the area be ruined by off-raod vehicles. These things are noisy as well as damaging to the terrain and the drivers are not always considerate of other users. Do we want to encourage further desecration of the natural beauty, while at the same time adding to pollution and unnecessary entegy usage?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8769    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:40:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Don't allow this beach to be ruined by vehicles!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8770    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Stephens, Paul E  
**Received:** May.07.2010 14:40:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Supt. Murray:

Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.

First, the 1000 meter buffer is not logical. Ask yourself why birds get well over a half a mile of protection when our children get much less protection in a "Drug Free School Zone". What makes the birds more precious than our children. Additionally, why is it these same birds nest so close to Highway 12, sometimes less than a hundred yards away, and do just fine? More so, why is it that similar species of birds nest in the tree along side my house 2' away from a walking path and 5' away from my driveway and they have hatch lings that fledged every year for the last 3 years? This 1000meter buffer seems to make more sense for elephants, not 6" birds. I fully support resource protection and enjoy the nature along Hatteras beaches but what is being proposed and what we have been subjected to the last 2 years makes no sense and is illogical.

Next, I am fortunate enough to be able to visit the Hatteras beaches every year with my 3 year old son and my 65+ year old parents. We have only been able to enjoy the beaches at Hatteras because we have been able to access the beaches with our 4 wheel drive vehicles. As my parents are older they have health issues and can not carry an enormous amount of supplies to the beach ie: food, blankets, drinks, etc. Even more difficult is with the toddler who has greater needs than my parents ie: diapers, shade tent, toys, food, drinks, etc. My wife and I can not carry everyone's supplies in addition to ours hence the need to access the beach with a vehicle. With out access to the beach with the vehicle, we can not bring the needed supplies therefore, we can not go to the beach. With that, we would not go to Hatteras at all either keeping our money or spending it elsewhere.

I certainly do not envy the task you have or the weight you have on your shoulders. I am sure you are reading stories similar to mine and can only hope you take them to heart in coming up with a reasonable solution that puts the beach back in hands of the people that love and respect the beach for as long as we have.

Sincerely, Paul Stephens and Family

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8771    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07.2010 14:40:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Many years ago when we were children we used to spend our vacations at the Cape Hatteras seashore. We treasure those memories of peace and quiet in a natural environment that few seem to be able to experience any longer today. That's why I'm astonished to learn that off-road vehicles might be permitted to destroy the area ~ threatening to ruin the stunning beaches while harassing wildlife. And the word is indeed "to harass". The beaches are their homes ~ apart from serving as protection to the shoreline. People who need to ride around all day in such beauty have precious little concern for what lives there. We need those creatures to maintain some serious balance in the eco-system.

It would seem to me that lobbyists from various industries are pushing these ORVs as they have done out west where I live now. This is beyond a shame ~ you're courting disaster. It would be a catastrophe of monumental ignorance to permit these highly offensive monsters to rage over the beaches. You may think there's "enough space" for everyone but you'd be sadly mistaken. The west is far emptier and bigger than back east but still not big enough to avoid these people and their machines. You would be amazed at how these ORV riders take over your life by noisily polluting neighborhoods and depriving us of silence.

I cannot even begin to tell you about the loss of habitat from these raucous obnoxious vehicles that we have had to endure out west. I have been here for over 25 years now and what I have witnessed is a tragedy.

Folks, if you haven't noticed, the country is shrinking. Pristine, beautiful, peaceful natural environments are becoming fewer and further between. There are just TOO MANY PEOPLE and far too much "industry" of all kinds. At this pace, your grandchildren will NEVER hear the call of a bird; watch a horseshoe crab slowly crawl its way to the shore or smell the sea breezes as they gently waft through their hair if you permit these angry machines to take over one of the few wonderful places we have left.

The only way we can continue to over-populate and still maintain our environment (the flora and fauna as well) is by making every possible effort to preserve it; one piece of land at a time. This is your conscience speaking and I hope you hear me.

By and large, the folks who feel they need to intrude deeper into the forests; further along our lovely beaches and higher into our wildest mountains are the same people who won't get off their behinds to take care of either themselves or the land. As I've often heard, "They jes wanna git out there and kill somethin'" or "show off some steel". At what cost I ask you? They simply don't care. Here today / gone tomorrow. Stop and watch them someday for awhile and you cannot help but observe what I mean. Enough should simply be enough.

Americans need to have places of tranquility left where they can go to breathe, think and pray without the filthy disturbance of the rank fumes of petrol. I know this doesn't seem fair to lump 4-wheelers into an nasty pile but I'm well into my 60's and I have seen the types of individuals who insist upon taking these noisy, smelly vehicles to every corner of the west with absolutely no concern for others or for the animals or the peace and quiet of the location. All they want to do is bring a week's worth of anxiety and neurosis to our last vestiges of calm. Don't let them! STOP THEM NOW while you can! We have paved roads for speed, showing off and noise.

Americans need to learn to walk again. Get their fat behinds off these vehicles and breathe deeply (if they still can with all those fumes!). The power they seem to obtain from wildly racing, skidding donuts and essentially terrorizing anyone or anything within miles of them goes straight to their heads where no brains reside. Why should the rest of America be forced to tolerate the intolerable? Have the brains for them.

Give America a break and do not permit these vehicles to further destroy what is left of our beautiful nation. We're destroying it one acre at a time. You don't need lots of science to "prove" anything. This is common sense. It's also pretty evident that if the vehicles and petroleum folks are willing to line enough pockets they'll have their way. So, if you're in charge of making a decision, I'm simply asking you to do the RIGHT thing ~ not the profitable thing. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8772    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07.2010 14:40:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8773    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:40:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8774    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:40:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8775    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8776    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8777    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8778    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8779    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8780    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8781    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8782    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 8783    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Donohue, M  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason. "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

My husband and I love the Outer Banks and all the beauty they have to offer. In fact, we spent our honeymoon enjoying the beaches in Cape Hatteras. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments on behalf of an area we cherish. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8784    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8785    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8786    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

0011273

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8787    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep our environment clean, quiet and protected. The beauty of nature allows us to be quite within ourselves and to learn to respect our world and the beauty of our own lives. Having grown up in southern California and camping regularly in Baja California where there were no laws against motor vehicles on the beach, I experienced first hand what they did to both the natural environment and to the human experience on those beaches. Please do not let our coastlines have the same fate of noise, pollution and destruction of the marine environment.  
Thank you for your attention.  
Sincerely,  
Lorie C. Ruskin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8788    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8789    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8790    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private



**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8791    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8792    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

I am an off-roader, but do so with respect to the environs and species that it may impact.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8793    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely, Cecilia Burns

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8794    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8795    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8796    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8797    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8798    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8799    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8800    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8801    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8802    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 I will not ever visit a beach that allows motor vehicles of any kind on them. No wonder Americans are so fat and lazy. The government is fat and lazy too, and spoonfeeding the lazy idiots. GET YOU CARS AND ORV'S OFF THE BEACH!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8803    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:41:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8804    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** thorp, charles  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:42:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** protect Cape Hatteras from pollution

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8805    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Matricino, Patrick F  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:42:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is and always has been, from man in several forms, not the least of which is offshore drilling as is evident now off the Gulf Coast. There should be absolutely NO off shore drilling in the future (starting now)...there are plenty of oil reserves under at least four Western States according to a recent USGS survey and subsequent report. Enough, in fact, to supply the entire world for the next forty years and more...so what the devil are we doing fouling the world's oceans with with more and more wells...do we not get it?? We are totally ruining one of the richest sources of food in the entire world, not to mention the fact that we're killing marine life at an alarming rate, and in every way we can think of! HELLO....wake up people. Think of this every time you go to your favorite restaurant looking for their seafood dish d'jour, and discover that it's no longer available because of either over fishing or ocean pollution. I know from experience (in Maryland) from ordering a fine plate of steamed clams and blue mussels w/ drawn butter, and finding out that the entire "crop" for the season had been devastated by pollution in the Bay, and perhaps if I came back in a week I could get them because they would try to import them from another area of the Country...but "be sure to call ahead"! In addition there is enough damage done every year, from off road vehicles racing along the shores, in the form of noise pollution and exhaust gases...not to mention the disruption of creature's habitats. These creatures were there long before we humans, and deserve at least to have their "homes" protected from us and our nonsense...don't you think? Oh...excuse me...that's exactly the whole point.....We don't think first before we perform our stupidity! Seriously folks ...we need to be more mindful of our responsibility to our fragile planet...it's the only one we have!! Thank You and may God Bless.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8806    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:42:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason. "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8807    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gladstone, David  
**Received:** May.07,2010 14:42:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My wife and I strongly feel you should not allow, or allow only at a very minimum, any off-road vehicles at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you for considering our comments.  
David and Melinda Gladstone

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8808    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Finley, Margaret and George  
**Received:** Apr.30,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Margaret E. and George B. Finley 50525 Timber Trail Post Office Box 522 Frisco, NC 27936 252-995-7882

April 29, 2010 Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Mr. Murray:  
I do not believe that the economic impact study in the DEIS is sufficient or factual.  
The economic impact will affect; Taxes we send to Raleigh from Dare County

? The taxes to support our school system ? The local job opportunities ? Loss of revenue from sales tax, transfer tax, etc ? Dare County will no longer be able to provide the services it now provides to its residents ? Property values will decline more ? Off island vendors will lose business and jobs ? Ocracoke will lose day trippers and the additional revenues ? More foreclosures due to loss of rental income ? Skilled workman will have to leave the island to seek employment ? Graduating students will have fewer job opportunities and will have to seek employment off-island ? The impact will be felt at new car dealerships in the state and in the region ? The island food banks are overwhelmed The economic impact is Region and State wide. The meetings in Raleigh and Hampton underscore your acceptance and understanding of that fact. Yet, your study is flawed; it is not just Dare County that will suffer under the impact of your actions.  
George B. Finley Margaret E. Finley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8809    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:42:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8810    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:42:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Those of us whole live in California have witnessed first hand the distruction caused by off-road vehicles. I hope someone has the presence of mind to say no to off-roading on Cape Hatteras. It will never be the same after people get done terrorizing the birds, running over little animals, and destroying the entire environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8811    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Stedman, Deborah  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:43:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8812    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** sullivan, linda  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:43:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do no pass the bill allowing off-road vehicles year round at Cape Hatteras. This will negatively affect the environment, the wildlife, and humans!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8813    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Valdez, Anne  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:43:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a taxpayer, I feel I should have input into the future of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Off road vehicles and the damage they do to the environment, the noise, pollution, disturbance of wildlife, do not belong there. Please see to it that they are prohibited or, at the very least, severely prohibited.

**Correspondence ID:** 8814    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

I firmly believe the birds, the turtles and other natural wildlife come first in this debate about how/when/who uses Cape Hatteras National Seashore and that the Park's job is to make sure absolutely that these wild things prosper. Keep the ORV's and people and dogs off the beach when the animals are about to migrate into the area, are nesting or feeding there etc. We must realize that shore birds of all types will rebound if not run over, disturbed etc....this has been demonstrated very well and they will die and fail if not protected from Human interference and sometimes their mere presence. Commercial interests must wait until the animals are finished with their beach life before the fishermen and their vehicles return. I do not believe the damage to commercial interests has been as severe as claimed and I am distressed with the selfishness of this vocal group. These USE UP the beach anyway-we-want people are ignorant of what is takes to maintain our bounteous ecosystem and are exploitive, leaving nothing for those of us who love nature. And what will future humans see when they go to the beach? ORV's? I hope not.

Thank You Martha Girolami

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8815    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:43:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8816    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Harris, John

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

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954

Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am opposed to Alternative F and support the Coalition for Beach Access position, with respect to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement Draft.

Kitty Hawk Kites operates three stores on Hatteras Island two of which have a 10-15 year history. Our store in Hatteras Village and Avon were off last year about 15%. Our other locations on the Outer Banks were down only 5%. Certainly a more restrictive plan in place such as alternative F would cause Hatteras Island visitors to decline and our store sales to decline more. As a result, jobs would be eliminated.

Much of Hatteras Island's Heritage is recreational, fishing, windsurfing, surfing, kiteboarding, swimming, walking on the beach, kayaking, and boating. To restrict access will restrict recreation on the island which in turn will reduce tourism and environmentally friendly recreation. This in turn will eliminate jobs. Restricted access will severely impact recreational tourism on Hatteras Island and what is the economy of Hatteras Island.

I am opposed to Alternative F. I do not understand the justification for the restrictiveness of this proposal. I support the Coalition for Beach Access Proposal.

Sincerely, John Harris

**Correspondence ID:** 8817    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:43:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 8818    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Jeffrey, James D  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:44:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I live in Virginia Beach, just across the border and visit the Seashore as well as bringing out-of-town visitors. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8819    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:44:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We must start protecting and nurturing the earth. We are slowly destroying the beautiful planet we have, and it's the only one. Don't destroy wildlife just so people can have "FUN". Let them use the ones already built for "fun." We don't need more. We need more wildlife and wildplaces.

**Correspondence ID:** 8820    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hertz, David E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.



3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
David Hertzell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8821    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:44:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8822    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:44:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8823    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:44:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8824    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:44:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8825    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:44:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8826    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:44:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8827    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Brennan, Robert E

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:44:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8828    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:44:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8829    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:44:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8830    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Our beaches and coastal plains, on both the eastern seaboard and out here in the west, are valuable wildlife habitat as well as areas of beauty that should be enjoyed by the public. However some forms of recreation, such as ORV driving, are destructive and clash with the natural environment, lessening the pleasure that others derive from the beaches and driving away birds, sea turtles and small mammals which have evolved to use beach front and dune habitats. ORV drivers have not evolved to drive on beaches, and they often do so without consideration for this environment! Although ORV drivers need a place to enjoy their sport, there surely must be other areas in which this can be done. The alternative plan D would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me and many other Americans.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total 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 MINIMUM of half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife (which are likely a larger "constituency" than ORV drivers). Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection MUST be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are bare minimums and should be increased as necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife, rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8831    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:44:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8832    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** unknown, unknown  
**Received:** May,03,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** "I Disagree"  
No Piping Plover have been caused by ORV's.  
Closures due to Birds and Turtles is a joke!  
Its all about the \$\$\$\$\$

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8833    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:45:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with

its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8834    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 14:45:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow off-road vehicles to destroy the beautiful Cape Hatteras. There are so few pristine places left in this country to visit, and too many already have been damaged beyond repair by the use of ORVs. They not only cause physical damage to the grounds, but also pollute the air and water, and scare off wildlife.  
Keep Cape Hatteras National Seashore protected and unblemished, so it will remain the peaceful national treasure that it is--for us and our future generations.  
Thank you for your time and consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8835    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Peele, Donna L  
**Received:** May.07.2010 14:45:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the way land mass for different species of birds has been calculated. Behind my home in Hatteras Village is many many acres of marsh that is not included in your calculations. Same holds true for Dredge Island and other habitats that the birds have already found. It seems to me that only NPS land has been calculated and those numbers are what is being used to justify this document.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8836    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I and the NPCA seek an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.  
Please adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting that which makes Cape Hatteras so special--abundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8837    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lawrence, Susan  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
It would be a real crime to allow Off Road Vehicles in Cape Hatteras National Seashore to be used year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors. Nothing organic about the sound or pollution these vehicles will make.  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8838    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 14:46:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8839    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:46:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely, Ashley Osinski

**Correspondence ID:** 8840    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Kelvington, James R

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. I have seen the senseless destruction of many areas in the southwest all for some cheap thrills and no sense of value for our environment. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

**Correspondence ID:** 8841    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Kitchens, Allegra

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:46:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not approve an offroad recreational vehicle management plan for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. You need to do everything possible to preserve this beach for pedestrians and wildlife. Dune-buggies, ATVs and other types of vehicles are injurious to wildlife habitat as well as people

walking or lying on the beach. I've seen this type of activity wreck havoc in Florida's woodlands, National Forests and beaches. Please prohibit all off-road recreational vehicles on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8842    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bell, Linda A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:47:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It's past time that we started really protecting our fragile natural resources, such as beaches and the wildlife that inhabits them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8843    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Finch, President, Johnny  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8844    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Keller, Robert  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:47:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
I realize the desire that people have to ride ORV's. I was a rider myself in my younger days. However, this area is just too environmentally significant to disturb in this way.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8845    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Busbey, Carol  
**Received:** May,03,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** My husband and I have owned a business here in Buxton for the last 33 years. We also own several pieces of commercial rental property in the same town.  
I am writing in regard to the D.E.I.S. and am questioning the lack of an economic impact statement on the effects of the beach closures on Hatteras Island and specifically the individual seashore villages on business.  
No one from the National Park Service and the environmental groups involved has ever talked to us or any of our renters about the impact the beach closures, especially Cape Point, has had on our businesses. I can tell you the day after Cape Point was closed two summers ago for the first time, we saw about a 25% drop in our weekend business. We also had many weekenders come in and tell us they were never coming back.  
I am asking how conclusions can be reached when the people that are the most affected by it are left out of the fact finding process?  
The affect on our community should have been on the top of the list of priorities and not left out completely.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8846    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** RAEHL, MARY  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:47:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep all vehicles, especially orv's off the roads of Cape Hatteras. Wildlife, animal life and the environment are at risk and have been. Animals have been killed and the land destroyed. Do something about it NOW. The lost lives cannot be brought back. Stop the crazy people and vehicles.

**Correspondence ID:** 8847    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:48:17  
**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:** 8848    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Smith, Kathy  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:48:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Thank you.  
Kathy Smith

**Correspondence ID:** 8849    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:48:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off-road vehicles off the Cape Hatteras beach. There is no reason to mar the shoreline and annoy bathers or walkers with these noisy, noisome machines. Beaches are for people to enjoy the sights and sounds and smells of the ocean. I know: I live near one and have a summer cottage near another.

**Correspondence ID:** 8850    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Martin, W. N  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
While I am a resident of central Virginia, I have on several occasions visited Cape Hatteras. For me the protection of wildlife habitat and non-motorized human access are the highest concern. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.



0011290

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
W.N. Martin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8851    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:49:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8852    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:49:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please take efforts to prevent off-road vehicles from destroying one of our precious resources and a symbol for the State. I support the environmentally preferable option D. Please uphold the protection of our landmarks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8853    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Finley, Margaret and George  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Margaret and George Finley 50525 Timber Trail Post Office Box 522 Frisco, NC 27936 252-995-7882 April 28, 2010  
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
Dear Mr. Murray:  
I have not read the entire DEIS, it is burdensome to print an 800+ page document on a home printer, and just as difficult to read it on a computer screen. I will, however, comment on several items it contains.  
The DEIS, option f, appears to use the Consent Decree as the starting point, therefore accepting the dictates of the environmental groups and a Judge as the base point.  
I disagree; the reasonable starting position should be the year prior to the consent decree.  
"ACHP (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation) Seeks to promote an approach to resource management and conflict on federally owned public land that achieves balance between natural and cultural values". The Park service has committed to the policy.  
In the DEIS there is little mention of: Community Heritage Culture of Native Islanders Culture of Local Residents Why was this given little thought? Why is everyone a visitor?  
The DEIS does not achieve the balance to resolve conflict.  
NEPA requires environmental justice. I believe that it asks who is bearing the brunt of the rulings in the DEIS. By building on the Consent Decree you have placed the burden squarely on the shoulders of the beach users, both pedestrians and ORVs. The DEIS does not meet the NEPA requirements.  
Again I disagree with option f.  
Why is Pea Island, a pedestrian-only beach, not used in totaling the set-aside for pedestrian-only beaches? M. & G. Finley (Superintendent Murray, page two)  
There is no scientific basis for a 1000 meter buffer around a hatched plover nest.  
I disagree with the parameters of the buffer, 200 meters for an unfledged chick or a plover nest is reasonable.  
Why did the Park Service mandate 1000 meters as the buffer, more than 6/10 of a mile?  
If the buffer is to be in all directions, would the ocean out to 1/2 mile be closed for a unfledged plover nest?  
I disagree with the 1000 meter buffer parameters.  
I disagree with closures or buffers for birds or nests that are not on the federal endangered or threatened list.  
"ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore..... "  
The only way my wife can get to the beach is by an ORV, she uses a wheelchair, except in our home, where she uses a cane or walker . Pedestrian-only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility.  
I disagree with the Special Use permits requirement that the vehicle used to transport a disabled person to the village beaches be returned to the street.  
I disagree that the DEIS is a fair and balanced approach and equitably meets the needs of the plovers and beach users.  
The decisions, or lack thereof, that the Park Service has made in the past have direct impact on the lives of residents in the seven villages on Hatteras Island. Our economy is reliant on visitors; you are chasing them away in droves. Our property values are reliant on a strong local economy and full beach access, the property values were holding better than most areas until the Consent Decree.  
I support "The Coalition for Beach Access? position paper.  
Please get it right this time.  
George Finley Margaret Finley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8854    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:50:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Thank you,  
Chetan Kumar

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8855    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:50:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is everyday that the destruction of serenity, wildlife habitat and pollution seems to dominate our resources and environment. The protections for migrating animals is now constantly at risk and threatened. Destroying plants and wildlife for the thrill of zooming around on our beaches and in our parks. I do not understand this, unless you look at the personal greed of ME, I and call this freedom. It isn't, -its greed or they don't know any better. Some may say I am more important and I have this right, It is my country this is my freedom.

This is wrong thinking, we should be thinking of US and WE for the betterment of our country, environment and our National Parks. Lets grow up and lead the moral path taught in the most elementary of schools to promote progress in environmental awareness and a better life for all, including protections for the environment and wildlife. Consider a nice quiet warm morning with a soft breeze in the air and wildlife to contemplate your most private thoughts. Now Imagine it with an off road vehicle screaming pistons and power smelling of gut wrenching fumes and accidentally near misses on wildlife or yourself. Stop it NOW. Look at the real freedoms that are taken away by allowing this. Save our National Parks and country from rapacious selfish greed. You need to know better.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8856    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Dillenger, Joyce  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:50:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have always enjoyed our visits to Washington's Ocean Shores area. This public beach does allow vehicles onto the beach during Prime Tourist Season, and it wreaks havoc. Of course, the off-roaders have a strong lobby so the environment doesn't have a chance. Every day we see the sad remains of small critters crushed beneath the wheels of joyriding idiots who like to GO FAST on the beach. Sometimes, w/the sounds of the surf and the roar of the wind, pedestrians don't hear the vehicles approaching in anything like time enough to move away if the drivers aren't paying attention as they blast along on the sand.

While it's nice to have multiple uses and while it's nice to accommodate various desires in public areas, is it REALLY necessary to have vehicles tearing up the shore and shoreline and compromising the fragile beach vegetation and wildlife?

In recent years Washington state has moved to limit off-road vehicle use of beaches to smaller areas. This might provide a model for compromise in this case too.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8857    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hetz, Michael H  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:50:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep Cape Hatteras free from degradation from vehicle use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8858    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Selquist, Donna J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:51:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I urge you to take action to permanently prohibit motorized traffic on any/all beaches along ALL our national coasts, but specifically at this time, Cape Hatteras. The overwhelming majority of people go to the shore to enjoy the water, the fresh air, and occasionally the wildlife. All of this is made either difficult or impossible by the presence of motorized traffic. Please don't allow the interests of a few to ruin the pleasure for the vast majority.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8859    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Jhangiani, Anka  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:51:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Beaches are places where people get close to nature; working out or strolling in leasure and observing waves crashing to shore or lapping the sand; watching birds hunting for food; watching the sunrise or sunset. Off-shore vehicles do NOT fit into this peaceful setting! Our family would totally shun a setting like this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8860    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Heilig, Lovie  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter**Correspondence:**

24229 Seasound Road Rodanthe, NC 27968 April 20, 20 10

Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, C 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray,

Mr. Murray, I am deeply concerned about the proposed beach closures on Hatteras Island.

With a struggling economy, open beaches are essential to the businesses in our area. I speak from personal experience. My brother and sister-in-law were forced to close their retail store in the tri-village area after a huge decline in sales following the closure of the Salvo ramp last summer. Furthermore, family members working in property rental programs including house cleaning and pool and spa maintenance have documented a decline in their weekly rentals, therefore, a decline in their available work and income as a result of limited beach access in our area. There are numerous retail spaces that remain empty after last summer, and I fear that the proposed closures will enhance the destruction of rental programs, retailers, and tourism on Hatteras Island. While some studies that incorporate tourism from northern beaches of the Outer Banks may suggest minimal economic influence, I assure you that the effects of beach closures on Hatteras Island are devastating. I have heard the manipulation of statistics to support limited beach access, but these statistics come in the form of homes that were already rented prior to newly enforced beach closures last year. Living across the street from a motel property, I have witnessed firsthand the frustration of visitors who will not be returning to our island simply because they can no longer have the vacation experiences of years past. The threat to the income of a majority of islanders is not an exaggeration. Unlike the migrating birds, many of these people lack the skill, education, ability or desire to live elsewhere. Having a history of eleven generations of family on Hatteras Island, the result of governmental regulation has forced us to sacrifice our land, relinquish our hunting and fishing livelihoods, and now, tourism, our only means of survival for most families, is being willfully destroyed. Clearly, the socioeconomic impact of Hatteras Island beach closures is being vastly understated. Advocacy of open beach access shouldn't conflict with the protection of wildlife. In fact, island natives demonstrate great passion for the preservation and maintenance of our natural resources. This is evidenced by our beach sweep initiatives and coastal studies programs within our schools. While protecting nesting areas is necessary, football field closures surrounding those areas are excessive. The majority of nest or hatchling disruptions have resulted from weather conditions. Only 3% of threats to nests have been human related. However, while there is little evidence to support human-related damages, law-abiding citizens are losing their freedom to access local beaches. This is equivalent to closing a major interstate highway as a result of a single speeding car. The punishment doesn't fit the crime. Furthermore, the 300 meter closures for ALL activities, including PEDESTRIANS as a result of state listed species is suspicious, especially when there's a category of birds titled "other," which leads me to believe that the species can be interpreted as "threatened" for the sole purpose of closing beaches. Many of the proposals are extreme and indeed seem to be designed to end beach driving entirely, which is unnecessary. Other east coast beaches have effective management plans in place that are far less intrusive to beach goers. Furthermore, unlike the northern beaches of the Outer Banks, Hatteras Island depends upon off-road access ramps for beach accessibility. Very little parking exists within the villages, and beach availability is limited to private property access. For years the off-road driving has been successfully regulated, and the balance between human access and protection of nature was achieved. Maintaining that balance is essential to the survival of Hatteras Island.

Overregulation of our island waters and beaches is damaging to our cultural heritage. According to the guidelines of the National Park Service upon its establishment on Hatteras Island, there should be a responsibility to preserve the "patterns of land use that reflect cultural traditions valued by the long term residents of the local community." There are still long term residents that remember when off road driving was the only access to our seashore and are now witnessing the prohibition of it. As a "Midgett" descendant, with more family than any other in the history of the United States Coast Guard, I can recall stories of ghosts, pirates, shipwrecks, picnics at the beach, and memories entwined in the unique culture of Atlantic heritage. The recreational and commercial fishing, surfing, kayaking, kite-boarding, and social gatherings, including evening bonfires, that attract visitors and locals to our shores are deep-rooted traditions of our land that should remain in tact. I ask that you please do all within your power to protect the precious identity of Hatteras Island. It is my hope that my daughter will be able to enjoy the liberties and legacies of our historical coastline.

Thank you, Lovie Heilig

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8861    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:52:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8862    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Shafransky, Paula  
**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.

The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over 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

0011293

area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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,  
Paula Shafransky

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8863    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hicks, Robert A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:52:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8864    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:52:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Carolyn Riddle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8865    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Belton, Dick  
**Received:** May,03,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I have just returned home from Hatteras Island where I participate in a fishing tournament each year. I was extremely disappointed to find the entire sound side of Hatteras Village closed due to nesting birds. This is a joke! According to locals I talked to. There are only three nests on the whole island, and they are in Buxton. Even if there were nests there, do the birds nest in the one road that leads to the sound?  
I understand also that the rangers are killing foxes and raccoons to protect the birds. What happened to the balance of nature?  
If the beaches are closed, as I understand they are going to be, what happens to the lifestyle of the people on the island whose forefathers owned the island in the first place?  
There are sensible ways to protect the birds and turtles if they need protecting without jeopardizing the local economy, but I don't think what I have seen and heard is anywhere close.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8866    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Conroy, Thomas R.  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:53:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
  - 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
  - 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
- Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Thank you.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8867	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:53:28						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8868	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	kurland, miriam						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:53:32						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not relax any of the environmental restriction on Cape Hatteras National Seashore or on any of the public lands. We need them to remain for future generations of people and wildlife.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8869	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:53:43						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please Help!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8870	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Neuhauser, Alice						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:54:09						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best</p>						

examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8871    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:54:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** URGENT: DON'T LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8872    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Todd-Dennis, Patricia  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:54:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is difficult for me to believe off road or any kind of vehicle would be allowed on Cape Hatteras. In my opinion, we should not allow vehicles on any beaches. Not only do vehicles tear up the beaches, but they are dangerous. People relaxing on beaches and vehicles tearing around do not go hand in hand.  
Let's stop tearing up the environment also. It is sad that from time to time we have natural causes such as storms and hurricanes which destroy our environment, but, we don't have to add man made destruction also. Right now I am thinking of the beaches on the Gulf Coast. Nature is delicate...treat it that way!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8873    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:55:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** While for some people an Off road vehicle may be the best way to get around, I think they are being a little bit lazy. The national Park notice that I have read says that the cape hatteras areas are open to ORV til 10pm. That is just plain ridiculous. There are people on the beaches, some maybe with children, and these people should be able to experience peace and quiet, They should also be safe. Some drivers of ORV do not drive them very safely. All ORV's should be banned altogether from locations where people are walking around. ORV's are also noisy and they can pollute the air. I won't go to a place if it is going to be noisier than the place I left.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8874    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:55:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** A few people get to have an adrenaline kick riding an off road vehicle -- a few people make a profit from the activity. The cost however is enormous to all of life. Human created noise pollution is as detrimental to our planet as all other forms of pollution.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8875    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cohen, Mary Ann  
**Received:** Apr,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** April 28, 2010  
Reference: page 469 in DEIS Book  
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954  
Dear Mr. Murray,  
What an awful time for you and your staff and for the residents and visitors of the National Seashore.  
I do not agree for total closure at the Point, Hatteras Inlet and Ocracoke Inlet. As a practical solution, cleaning vegetation, that is not endangered, would provide enough breeding/nesting/fledging space for all nesting state-listed/special status species. With increasing the open, sandy substrates, there would be room for bird closures, ORV and pedestrian use.  
Thank you.  
Yours, Mary Ann Cohen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8876    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:55:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** DON'T LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!  
This is the worst possible place to allow ORV use.  
Don't do it!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8877    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

0011296

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Colleen Lobel

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8878	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:56:07						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We will keep this short, we all know what careless actions like this will end up doing to another beautiful area in America. Does any one in charge know what common sence is? B Goodwin						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8879	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:56:12						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not allow recreational vehicle use in the Cape Hatteras National Park. The main reason for creating national parks is to protect wildlife and scenic wonders for the enjoyment of future generations. How is this consistent with motorized recreation which does the exact opposite? Let science and law be the guiding influence rather that special interest groups who shout the loudest. Thank you for being fair and reasonable.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8880	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:56:18						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the National Park Service (NPS) 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. I seek an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8881	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:56:37						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8882	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Compton, Carole M						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:56:40						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The Outer Banks is the most pristine seashore in the country. Places in North and South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida that I have seen look dirty in comparison, and they allow vehicles on the beach in the off season.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8883	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 14:56:52						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing to strongly encourage adoption of a modified Alternative D of the draft Alternative Impact Statement to protect Cape Hatteras wildlife and pedestrian visitors from the noise and destruction caused by off road vehicular traffic. Endangered shorebirds and sea turtles must have our utmost protection!						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8884	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Gould, Jr., Burnham S						
<b>Received:</b>	Apr,29,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Burnham S. Gould, Jr. 71 Gravey Pond Lane, Southern Shores, NC 27949 April 28, 2010 Mr. Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore, 1401 National Park Drive, Manteo, NC 27954						

Re: Driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore Dear Mr. Murray:

I wish to go on record as strongly opposing the continuation of driving on the fragile beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The growth of off road vehicles and their use on beaches during the last few decades has destroyed the aesthetics and beauty of much of the area. For the sake of future generations the National Park Service must seek to redress the situation.

Driving on public beaches was, fundamentally, a recreation of the last third of the twentieth century. It was fun while it lasted. However, now we are in a new century. We know, or should know, about the terrible environmental and aesthetic damage that beach driving has caused.

People need to respect the interdependent web of all life. We humans enjoy being members of a very adaptable species. When we encounter other species which cannot adapt to our desires, like Piping Plovers, American Oystercatchers, Black Skimmers, Loggerhead Turtles, and many others, we must get out of the way. To protect our wildlife the overwhelming weight of scientific opinion indicates that beaches must be vehicle free, at least during the spring and summer breeding season. Fortunately, non motorized human access appears to be less of a problem.

The time has come to firmly ban beach driving, at least during the spring and summer months. Non motorized access can continue to be enjoyed where, in the opinion of respected scientists; it is minimally disruptive to wildlife.

Please do your best to insure that the National Park Service will use the current review of off road vehicle management on Cape Hatteras National Seashore to preserve and protect its beaches, to restore the unique ambience which it has provided, and to help the wildlife that needs it to live and thrive. Thank you.

Yours truly, Burnham S. Gould, Jr.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8885    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:57:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the vehicles off the area. Leave it for the animals and folks on foot that will do no harm.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8886    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:57:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sincerely Mary Ellen Massey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8887    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Shogren, Gary S  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8888    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Nash, Jonathan  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:57:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,



As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8889    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:57:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras should not ever be used for off road vehicles. They are destructive to wildlife habitats and people who want to enjoy the peace and quiet of nature. Please give some Park Rangers jobs keeping these orvs out.  
We need to preserve this area from invasion by man. Man on foot, fine. After the gulf oil spill, this area especially needs to be protected. Turtles are so vulnerable, the picture of the run over turtle is tragic. We could set up jobs for people to protect habitat. If people keep on rampaging what nature areas we have left it will be ruined by the few for the many. And for all generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8890    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** CLOUD, DON E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:57:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Don't destroy a great beach with all of its natural benefits.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8891    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Karaczun, Alex  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:58:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There is a place for ATV's but it is definately not the Hatteras national sea shore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8892    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wright, Margo A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,  
Margo A. Wright

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8893    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Fahy, Diana E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement

privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Chris

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8894    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:58:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live in Arizona. We have areas of rock and sand and heat. Off road vehicles are welcome there. Why would you ever welcome them to such a beautiful place.  
Clinton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8895    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Snowden, Patricia S  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a supporter of national parks, I want to 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. It is among this nation's few undeveloped beaches, and its peaceful beauty is enjoyed by families and birders. 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. While none of the alternative plans outlined in the draft is acceptable, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service must not ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8896    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:59:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Hatteras free of off road vehicles. Protect those portions of land that are special, sacred places.  
Thank you,  
Carol Jason  
I love Hatteras because of the quiet beauty of the place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8897    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Berkshire, David C  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:59:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** What could you be thinking. Offroad vehicles and wildlife do not mix; period.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8898    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Steinger, Robert  
**Received:** May,07,2010 14:59:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely, Robert Steinger

**Correspondence ID:** 8899      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

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

**Received:** May,07,2010 14:59:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8900      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596      **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:00:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8901      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Bates, Kim

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:00:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Leave the beaches free from the disruption that ORV would cause. Wildlife needs quiet beaches to raise their young.

**Correspondence ID:** 8902      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Bodeman, Ruth A

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:00:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8903	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Velsmid, Stephanie				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:00:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is important to keep some areas pristine. Quiet allows us to think and feel. Please protect our coastal areas for future generations.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8904	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Vance, Ron				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:00:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I thank you for the opportunity to comment on this plan. I visited the park last year with my family. I have to say that the park is a valuable resource of preserved shoreline in a region where shoreline is being rapidly developed. It was a fabulous opportunity to show my children what the beach is like naturally, without high rise resorts or beach houses.</p> <p>I was however, greatly disappointed in the amount of vehicle traffic that was along the beach at that time. In fact my children, ranging in age from 2-6, commented on how those cars should not be on the beach as it was the homes for all of the creatures we learned about in the visitors center.</p> <p>They too feared crossing the beach to get between the parking lot and the water as large vehicles approached rapidly to make it either onto or off of the beach. This was the most unpleasant part of our experience in the park. Had the vehicle traffic then been more limited, our experience would have been greatly enhanced.</p> <p>National parks should be about preserving the environment in it's natural state. Yes, there need to be opportunities for recreation, but I do not it should be at the expense of experiencing the natural wonder of an undisturbed beach.</p> <p>So in this manner I am disappointed in the plan as it currently stands and would urge the park service to revise to emphasize the preservation and protection of undisturbed areas to allow children like mine a safe and enlightening opportunity to discover the natural wonder that is Cape Hatteras National Seashore.</p>				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8905	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Maryanski, Joe				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:00:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am against allowing off road use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I feel that this use is not consistent with maintaining the area as a pristine national landmark. I fear that this use will allow pollution from the vehicles and their users and destroy the peace and serenity of the beach for both fowl and other human users who are not car or truck or ORV bound. I believe that certain lands within our country are better left untouched by motorized mechanized travel and the destruction to habitat that comes from this form of travel. These lands should be open to only those that care to expend their own personal human energy to explore. Thank You for allowing me to statemy opinion.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8906	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Leon, Mary A				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:00:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep Cape Hatteras noise free and safe for all!				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8907	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Benfield, Knolan				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:00:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Yellowstone and snow mobiles, Hatteras and ORV, Grand Canyon and flyovers.... Has the Park Service forgotten why it exist?				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8908	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Band, David				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."</p> <p>Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>				

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
David M. Band MD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8909    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:00:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8910    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lander, Traci  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras is one of my most favorite places in the united states. Its beauty lies in its serene culture and bonanza of special wildlife to observe. When I am there I am aware of the fragile nature of the land around me. As an avid snowmobiler, I really appreciate the availability of public lands to enjoy this sport. However, knowing the fragility of this area and the punishing toll machines can take on any area, I have to speak out against allowing year round access by these 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 draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Traci Lander

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8911    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a resident of Mount Desert Island, location of Acadia N.P. you can tell I am a strong supporter of environmental sound management of our national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. ORVs are disruptive both by noise and by destruction of fragile habitats. Overall, the approach in the draft EIS is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Joan H. Bromage

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8912    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:01:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8913    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:01:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** less off road vehicle access.. better for wildlife and quiet pedestrians.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8914    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, While I have not been fortunate enough to be able to visit Cate Hatteras yet in my life, when I do make the trip I do not want to find a beautiful natural area of special importance overrun with ORV vehicles or tracks. It is vital to protect this area for wildlife and human use in a way that supports the integrity of the place. ORVs do not belong in a National Seashore. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you 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, Karen Nelson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8915    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

0011304

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
  - 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
  - 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS 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:** 8916    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hanson, Nancy A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:02:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** How could we even think of letting any motorized vehicles on that beautiful beach and ocean habitat. NO!!!!!!!  
Nancy A. Hanson 924 Cleveland Rd. Hinsdale, IL 60521

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8917    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:02:20  
**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:** 8918    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Freese, Lisanne  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:03:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We spend all our vacation at National Parks. Consistently, vehicle users seem to get priority. ATVs are ruining historic indian sites, power boat users disturb our quiet paddle and endanger our lives, planes fly over the Gran Canyon while we're trying to enjoy some peace and quiet. ORVs, ATVs, JetSkis, you name it, DO NOT belong on a national seashore.  
Here's what belongs on the beach: sand, driftwood, sea creatures, birds, turtles, people respectful of nature. Period.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8919    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:04:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Murray,  
I am surprised and unhappy with the prospect of expanded ORV use at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. As someone who grew up spending summer months on the Hatteras shore, I am staunchly opposed on moral grounds to ORV use along the sea-shore, especially when ORV thrill-seekers can go to less sensitive habitat for their recreation.  
More importantly, expanded ORV use is contrary to (my understanding of) the laws governing national seashore which include the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation which state that the area is intended, inter alia, to protect wildlife and the habitat on which it depends.  
When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to limit ORV use, making it subordinate to less destructive human uses and to wildlife and habitat conservation.  
Yours Sincerely,  
Jamison Suter Princeton, New Jersey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8920    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:04:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8921    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Beard, Lara

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:04:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely, Lara Beard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8922    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** De Robbio, Elisabetta

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** no comment

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8923    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Mullen, Timothy I

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:04:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Yours sincerely

TIMOTHY I MULLEN

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8924    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.

I have however, reviewed the 77-page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated



rulemaking process, and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8925    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Too often we lose site of the purpose of the parks: to protect and preserve our natural heritage from destruction. If people cannot enjoy the parks without loud, polluting, invasive, destructive machines, then they really have no place being there in the first place....they have missed the point. Those activities belong in urban areas or those areas not designated as parks. Hasn't enough damage been done already? Please stop doing this to our parks...people say it is only going to hurt a little...but little by little is how we got to this place in time on this planet. If the parks can't remain protected, what hope do we ever have of saving this 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, Deidra Zolezzi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8926    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:05:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8927    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Martin, Marilyn  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a strong supporter of national parks, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on North Carolina's Outer Banks. The area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many others who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. This approach is clearly unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service must exercise its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which that wildlife depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the clear intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is essential that the National Park Service protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert the National Park Service's authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources to achieve wildlife species recovery goals in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis.  
I appreciate the National Park Service's hard work and dedication in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations and look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

0011307

**Correspondence ID:** 8928    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hanify, Tim  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:05:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Having grown up in southern California my entire life, I have seen first-hand the destructive effect of off-road vehicles in ecologically sensitive environments. While some drivers of these machines are aware of their potentially damaging forays, most of them seem to take pleasure in ripping up the land and hurting or killing the wildlife in the area. Many days during my youth, I would come across desert tortoises with their carapaces crushed by dirt bikes and dune buggies. Some vehicle tracks show that the vehicle actually veered off their course just to make sure they squashed the defenseless animals. Of course, that no longer is much of a problem, since the desert tortoise is now nearly extinct! KEEP THESE NOISOME, DEVASTATING, VEHICLES AND THEIR DRIVERS IN CLOSED IN AREAS ONLY!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8929    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:05:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please PRESERVE Hatteras National Seashore and Bird Habitat from ORVS detraction!!!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8930    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Tellinghuisen, Joel  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:06:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Pristine beaches are best kept that way ... and that especially means no off-road vehicles. Please do not open this area to such vehicles.  
Joel Tellinghuisen Nashville

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8931    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Jansen, Kimberly K  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:06:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8932    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Light, Lillian K  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:06:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is very important to preserve our seashores for birds and other sea life, and for people to enjoy swimming, picnicking, and bird watching. Lillian Light

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8933    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Buckner, Carolyn M  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:06:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
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. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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.  
Sincerely,

**Correspondence ID:** 8934    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." ORV users have demonstrated time and again that they are unable to live up to this requirement.  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and not allow ORV use to harm wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8935    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:07:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Why would you even consider allowing ORV's on Cape Hatteras National Lakeshore? Our endangered and threatened species are all ready in danger. Don't kill them off entirely! This is also a pristine area which must be preserved for future generations. And you want to destroy this beautiful area so that people in the future cannot enjoy it! Shame on you! You must oppose this abomination! Leave Cape Hatteras and our wildlife be as they are. Do something to help them, not destroy them!

**Correspondence ID:** 8936    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Schmid, George A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:07:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8937    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:07:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The use of motorized vehicles should be restricted to those who need them to be able to access the park. Controlling the use of ORV on sensitive areas, will be an difficult task and will require many manhours. I have witnessed the use of ORV's in these areas in Florida. They are rarely used for transportation. They become racy, noisy, and a threat to other people.

**Correspondence ID:** 8938    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Engler, Pamela M  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:07:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect this valuable shoreline from destruction by the operation of ORV!  
I believe this is important both now and into the future!

**Correspondence ID:** 8939    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Kate Miller Please help us!

**Correspondence ID:** 8940      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Smith, Adrian D

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:08:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8941      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596      **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:09:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not pass this management plan that includes so much off-road vehicle use in the national park. Not many of our beaches are preserved for wildlife and this plan seems to threaten one of the few beautiful and peaceful beaches for nature and pedestrians with nearly uninhibited traffic and pollution. Please preserve this site's integrity. Thank you!

**Correspondence ID:** 8942      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Bennett, Michael V

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

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep off road vehicles off the beaches.

**Correspondence ID:** 8943      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596      **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:09:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** National Parks should first be FOR all the natural features and for the wild/native animals and secondarily for PEOPLE to have the opportunity to experience UN-SPOILED NATURE. OFF ROAD VEHICLES HAVE ONLY NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON ALL THE ABOVE -- AND--NO REDEMING FEATURES.

**Correspondence ID:** 8944      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Sheridan, Gabriel T

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

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep Off Road Vehicles in third place after wildlife, first and foot traffic second. This is a special place for all Americans.

**Correspondence ID:** 8945      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596      **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:09:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There is a need to limit ORV's on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore because of the negative impact on nesting birds and sea turtles, as well as the noise pollution and damage to the shoreline. Please keep these negative impacts in mind when making your final decision. Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 8946    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:09:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It's important to preserve our beaches! Please do all you can.

**Correspondence ID:** 8947    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hansen, Mike  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:10:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sincerely, Mike Hansen

**Correspondence ID:** 8948    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:10:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Thank you for your consideration in this important matter.  
Sincerely,  
Bob Cavaluchi

**Correspondence ID:** 8949    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Robinson, Jennifer L  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:10:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow off-road vehicles on Cape Hatteras. Off-road vehicles are detrimental to the fragile ocean eco-systems found in places like Cape Hatteras. We need to preserve what little ocean wetlands we have so that marine life have nesting and feeding grounds, and for future generations to enjoy the pristine beauty of the Southeast shore. Thanks.

**Correspondence ID:** 8950    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Walters, Jim  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:10:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Although the NPS has never assessed Cape Hatteras for wilderness suitability, it somehow manages to develop a management program for off-road vehicles. This is a back-assward approach to the stewardship of our public resouces and the National Park Service should be ashamed.

**Correspondence ID:** 8951    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mineo, Alan  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please help us do what we can to save what little natural environments that we have left.

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,

**Correspondence ID:** 8952    **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 supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches.

All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant.

Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 8953    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:10:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 8954    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:10:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8955    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8956    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points:  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 I believe in responsible use of ORVs, as long as the big picture of sustainability and preservation of critical and delicate habitats is also factored into a sensible solution.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8957    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the

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

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

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

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

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

I have camped and rented on Hatteras for over 25 yrs. Please protect the island.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8958    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8959    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8960    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent



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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8961    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8962    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8963    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8964    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8965    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8966    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8967    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8968    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8969    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8970    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8971    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8972    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8973    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8974    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8975    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8976    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:36  
**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:** 8977    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:36  
**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:** 8978    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lynch, Marguerite A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have lived 92 years in the United States and wish to have the natural beauty of this country stay beautiful for my great-grandchildren to see and enjoy. I feel that the beautiful ocean beaches are a place for people to walk and feel the wonder and in between their toes. Mechanical vehicles should not be permitted in these places. Protect our parks and natural beauty spots

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8979    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** sampson, joan  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:11:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not open another of our protected places to year round traffic. It is not a necessary move and can do irreparable harm to our wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8980    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:13:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We really don't need more reason to burn gasoline! We need clean beaches. Given the catastrophe in the Gulf with the oil spill, we need to safeguard our beaches in as many ways as possible.  
This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8981    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:13:29  
**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 to not harm wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8982    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** jhangiani, arjan k  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:13:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No off-road vehicles on the seashore or beaches, please.

**Correspondence ID:** 8983    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:13:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 8984    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Alternative D 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 had a chance to witness the destruction that unregulated ORV use has upon the desert where I live in California. I would not wish to see that sort of thing visited upon the beautiful but fragile environments of Cape Hatteras.  
If alternative D is not chosen, at least try to ensure that visitors not of the one special interest group get a chance to have the same access and privileges as the ORV users.  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This is not a fair balance for wildlife and other users. At the very most, at least half the beach should be available year round for wildlife and non-ORV users.  
Why not put natural resources and wildlife first, and recreational use interests second? The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Alternative F ignores the best scientific information and recommendations. In the end, there are many alternatives to Cape Hatteras for ORV users to avail themselves of; the shorebirds and turtles don't have other options.  
Any plan selected should include clear goals for wildlife recovery with well-established milestones that can be assessed. These goals need clear review from the scientific community to keep them realistic. The recovery plans should be based upon the historic productivity of the seashore, not its current reduced capacity in this regard. And recovery needs to receive first priority.  
I appreciate the chance to offer input, and thank you for your time and attention. I will be following the progress of the Cape Hatteras issue and hope a more balanced final plan that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore will be chosen, for the benefits of all visitors.

**Correspondence ID:** 8985    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:13:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 8986    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 15:13:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8987    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 15:13:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8988    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. . If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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 preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. In the past two weeks it has become abundantly clear how fragile our coast lines are. We may experience the extinction of numerous species previously protected due to the BP oil rig disaster. Cape Hatteras may be one of the few breeding sites for sea turtles and rare birds after the effects from this disaster are felt in years to come.  
I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8989    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596



**Name:** Ratcliff, Rebecca A  
**Received:** May.07.2010 15:13:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** With the ever-growing oil spill closing in on America's beaches, it is critical to keep what habitat we can. To willingly allow the destruction, while a catastrophe is looming is ridiculous. Please do not allow this to happen. Off-roading is a mindless, unnecessary waste of resources. Let these people take their noisy vehicles to a track or some other place. To allow this activity in a wilderness is unconscionable. Please think forward to the future and what must be saved.  
 Thank you for your attention.  
 Rebecca Ratcliff

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8990    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 15:14:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sadly, I have lived in areas along the seashore that allowed driving, and it not only spoiled it for walkers and wildlife, but made it dangerous to both pedestrians and drivers. Please reconsider your plan to open Cape Hatteras to ATV's.  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8991    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Edwards, Eric  
**Received:** May.07.2010 15:14:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8992    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 15:14:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8993    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:14:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8994    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:14:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8995    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:14:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8996    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:14:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8997    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:14:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8998    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:14:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would be in favor of limiting ORV use at the seashore. Not increasing it. Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8999    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:14:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9000    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:14:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9001    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:14:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9002    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:14:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9003    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Malmberg, Greg B  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:14:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,  
I may be a WASP, but the Native Americans had it right. The land is not ours to destroy, but a precious gift! It is our duty to be proper stewards and be in the position to pass it down to our descendants!  
Thank You, Greg Malmberg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9004    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:15:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep our parks free from the hassle and noise of these vehicles. I like to enjoy the whole park when I visit a Nat'l Park, and these would definitely be a major distraction as well as a hazard. There are plenty of other places for this sport. I don't think they need to invade the parks. Please keep some part of America for beauty and serenity.. Sincerely Aileen Murphy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9005    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Giles, Al  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:15:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Do not allow off road vehicles in parks and natural areas. They tear up the environment. There are plenty of other areas for them to use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9006    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:16:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I hope that you will reconsider the plan for allowing off-road vehicles to so predominately figure into your plans for the Cape Hatteras Shore. Having moved from North Carolina to Alabama, the natural wonders that NC holds can be unmatched when considered as a whole. Allowing such destructive use of one of those treasures is irresponsible. Haven't we driven over enough of this country without taking the few wild, beautiful places we have restricted it and opening it up to vehicles. Please do not allow this to happen.

**Correspondence ID:** 9007      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Floyd, Stacy

**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Stacy Floyd

**Correspondence ID:** 9008      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

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

**Received:** May.07.2010 15:16:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The National Park System should not have to fight off the endless onslaught of road-building and vehicles destructive to wildlife and beaches which they were designed to protect in the first place!

**Correspondence ID:** 9009      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596      **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07.2010 15:17:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** we do not need 4 wheel vehicles on the fragile shorelines...they ruin the environment, the eco system and scare the wildlife.

**Correspondence ID:** 9010      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596      **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07.2010 15:17:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9011      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Setaro, Michelle

**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Decision Maker:

Please adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting that which makes Cape Hatteras so special--abundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore. This is their home and should protect it as decent humans beings.

Respectfully, Michelle R. Setaro

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9012    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wynne, Diane  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely, Diane Wynne

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9013    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mullin, Anne E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:18:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am appalled that the National Park Service would even consider allowing off-road vehicles to tear up and pollute with noise and chemicals our irreplaceable park lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9014    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Reiter, Marcia E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:19:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In a world dominated by noise, lights, exhaust there needs to be a few places left in the world where one can go to escape, not just for humans for the wildlife who call it home and try to raise their young there. Please don't open Cape Hatteras to ORVs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9015    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Savett, Adam  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
Please accept the following as my comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses..., the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for your consideration and the opportunity to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9016    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:19:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9017    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Carnein, Carl R  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:20:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I recognize that it's pretty difficult to enforce regulations governing off-road vehicles. That may be the reason the National Park Service proposes to decrease regulation of their use. However, although there may be small portions of the national park system that should be open to off-road-vehicle use, I believe tight restriction is the appropriate approach in most places. Off roaders have shown a disregard for or ignorance of the reasons to stay on designated trails, and our public lands are being decimated by them, at the very time that overpopulation puts unsustainable pressure on natural habitats all over the country. I urge the National Park Service to maintain tight restrictions on off-road-vehicle use in all of the lands under its jurisdiction.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9018    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** mulder, joel d  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:20:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please preserve one of the most important beach/estuary environments in the world. Prohibit motorized vehicles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9019    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Raymond, Michael R  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Mike Raymond

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9020    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:21:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have been vacationing on Ocracoke with many family members for more than 10 years and I never plan to change my vacation spot. The main reason we love the island is of course the serenity and beauty. We went to Myrtle Beach 1 year because of a hurricane that hit the Outer Banks and it made me realize even more what a special place Ocracoke really is. The residents and vacationers obviously respect the Island and as a result the beach and the town are very clean. They also respect the dunes and sections that are closed. I have never seen anyone walk on or even attempt to destroy these areas. We bought a Jeep about 6 years ago with the main purpose being to get to the beach. We do not go 4x4'ing on the beach nor have I been witness to such actions. Without a car to get to the beach there would be no way to bring what is needed for a 7-8 hour day enjoying the beauty of the it. I understand why there are closed off sections on the island. I also realize that when space is limited and there are too many people in one area it is just another beach-something else I realized at Myrtle Beach. Please remember that the tourists are a major source of income for this Island. What will happen to the people if that ends?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9021    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:21:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I visited those beaches last year. How beautiful they are. White sandy long slopping beaches. But now I find that you are going to allow cars/ORV on those lush beaches. In my experience not all people are responsible enough to be left to their own devices. What I mean is will they clean up after their cars drop various oil and other fluids on these beaches. Will everyone respect the wildlife that flourish during the daylight and night time. Will trash be picked up. What will be the impact on the overall environment. We have lots of beaches that are already widely used by the public. Why a supposed "National Seashore" being open to the public like this, when staffing shortfalls in my opinion may not allow for the supervision these kinds of activities



may require. Bottom line is protect our seashores they are all we have.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9022    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wald, Aloysius J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:21:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have yet to see an area where off road vehicles are allowed that did not suffer from degradation of environment and mindless rowdyism. Though vehicles are not necessary to having a good time, the off road vehicle industry and the minority who insist on having off road vehicles always demand access to every conceivable recreation area. Generally, the off roaders do not give a single thought to anyone else use of the area and become aggressive to anyone who dares to use the area or infringe on "their rights". Here is another instance of a selfish minority demanding "their rights" to the exclusion of the rights of all other users. It is time for the off road minority to get out of their gas swilling, pollution producing, thrill boxes, get on their two legs and appreciate the silence and wonder of nature. Enough of catering to these arrogant fools.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9023    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:21:59  
**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:** 9024    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:22:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The well-being of sea turtles and shorebirds should take precedence over the convenience of ORV users. This should be obvious. Please give wildlife a chance!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9025    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bradley, DJ  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:22:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe there is a place for Off-Road Vehicle use and the National Parks isn't one of them! There are many other places where people can enjoy off-roading, but the National Parks should be kept for quite activities. Many people go to the parks for quite, let's keep it like that.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9026    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Poten, cynthia E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:22:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It would be ecologically irresponsible to expand the use of Cape Hatteras recreational beaches to off-road vehicles. Their environmental impact could be very damaging to the fragile environment there, especially to creatures who nest in the sand. The use of these vehicles in recreational areas is also very detrimental to users who are there to appreciate the beauty and serenity of a natural environment. It's very depressing to visit a beloved natural area and find people zooming around on motorized vehicles. We need to start reducing the number of places people ride around in, not increasing them.  
Thank you. Cynthia Poten

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9027    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Johnson, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:22:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras is a beautifully serene place. We enjoyed our visit to this national seashore. However, ORV are further endangering our threatened and endangered species by killing wildlife and destroying critical habitat. Please exercise protection for the species and habitat as you review this serious issue. ORV riders/drivers often also disregard basic safety codes and noise regulations. We are appalled by the recklessness sometimes exhibited. We have barely missed being hit by ORVs on coastal shores in this country and Mexico. Multiple times, we have witnessed habitat degradation from careless use of ORVs. Please reign in and restrict the use of these vehicles, as well as require skill and sensitivity training as a part of a licensing program. JJ

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9028    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant.

Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations.

I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Jennifer Connors

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9029    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Fox, Eleanor  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, andDear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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 that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9030    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Seltzer, Rob  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:23:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Offroad activities are incompatible with quiet enjoyment of others or preservation on conservation of the area and its environment and wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9031    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:23:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have visited Cape Hatteras National Seashore on vacation and love its quiet, pristine landscape. It is a wonderful place for renewal & reflection as well as a wild area. I am writing to urge you not to allow off-road vehicles on the Seashore. The Park Service created the National Seashore to protect it from such things. Please abandon this idea, as it would significantly change this wonderful place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9032    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must 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 realize that some people may consider the use of ORVs in National Parks as something that should be allowed, but in general, I disagree. National Parks should be for preserving natural areas of significance in this country. They should be playgrounds for all of the nation's people, yet be left wild and undisturbed to the best of our ability, preserving them for numerous future generations. ORV use within this park or any other one in this country is not consistent with my views of what a National Park should offer or support.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
 Andrew List

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9033    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Tidwell, Stephanie P  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:24:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep ORV's off of the Cape Hatteras shore. Their noise is distracting not only to those wishing to enjoy the natural landscape but also a disruptor of native wildlife, impeding migratory movement and breeding and nesting behavior.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9034    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:25:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off-road vehicles have no place on the Cape Hattaras National Seashore. This is an ecologically sensitive area that should be preserved for pedestrian use and wildlife habitat. Please consider the environmental impact of off-road vehicles and reconsider the proposed rules!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9035    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:25:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please, no Off Road Vehicles Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It's the seashore, not a highway!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9036    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:25:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9037    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kurtz, Nancy B  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:25:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep the Cape Hattaras National Seashore vehicle free and safe from undo noise and tire erosion. People need to visit the shoreline and enjoy nature not use nature as a amusement park ride.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9038	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is utterly ridiculous to even consider allowing noisy motor vehicles to intrude upon our parks, Cape Hatteras in particular. Stand up for pristine, unpolluted air, land and water by being a conservator of the land. Good stewardship requires knowing when and how to say, "No!" and supporting that decision where necessary. Stop this unwanted and unnecessary strain on Cape Hatteras, and maintain our park the way it was meant to be, natural and free of noise and air pollution. Thank you for having the courage to do the right thing for our country as well as for the many people who utilize and appreciate our nation's parks.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9039	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:26:17						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Once again those of us who care about the environment and the natural beauty of this country are stymied by the bizzare plans of a few who don't seem to care! This is an outrageous plan that must be stopped.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9040	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:26:19						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service CANNOT IGNORE its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife MUST take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9041	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:26:19						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Pls Reduce & Limit the use of Off Road Vehicles from our Parks Shorelines, esp. Cape Hatteras National Seashore.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9042	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9043	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Lewis, John M						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D.

**Correspondence ID:** 9044    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** DellaLoggia, Denis

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:28:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am totally against any off road vehicles using the beaches of the barrier islands of North Carolina and all other states. Barrier islands are important as nesting areas and must be preserved.

**Correspondence ID:** 9045    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Scherwin, John C

**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 would support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV limited use only if it can occur without even the potential for harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,  
John C. Scherwin

**Correspondence ID:** 9046    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:28:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9047    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

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

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:28:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9048    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Dent, Christopher A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:28:59  
**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:** 9049    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:29:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9050    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Epstein, Kelly E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Kelly Epstein

**Correspondence ID:** 9051    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Baker, Paul

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:29:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Off-road vehicles are an excellent example of an egregious UNSUSTAINABLE environmental degrader!!!! PLEASE Keep them off Hatteras and everywhere else. It is not written in the Constitution that anyone gets to ride to drive anywhere over anything.

The era of easy access to fossil fuels is almost over. It's time to wean our culture from the car. Expanding the opportunities for off-road vehicles is taking us in exactly the wrong direction. Why isn't this obvious?

Every one who cares about the National Parks knows that the noisy, destructive presence of off-road vehicles is the exact opposite of the natural setting that most people are seeking in the parks. Why isn't this obvious?

Please keep our parks as havens for unspoiled nature. Keep the internal combustion engine off the beach. PLEASE!

**Correspondence ID:** 9052    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Epstein, Kelly E

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:29:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Sincerely,

Kelly Epstein

**Correspondence ID:** 9053    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Nerwick, Randall M

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:30:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9054    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

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

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:31:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** NO ORV!

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9055	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:31:08					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please protect what's left of the beautiful Cape Hatteras shoreline from noise and pollution.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9056	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Little, Andrea					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:31:09					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't allow vehicles onto the Cape Hatteras seashore. It is a beautiful pristine area enjoyed by humans and wildlife. Allowing vehicles would be disruptive to all lifeforms as well as detrimental to the dunes and vegetation.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9057	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:31:15					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kathy Harvey</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9058	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	krause, karen					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p> <p>Sincerely, karen krause</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9059	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:31:26					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>The beauty and peace of the National Seashore can be marred by the use of ORV's and ATV's. These dirty, noisy machines also offer unnecessary threat to wildlife--nesting sea turtles, birds, and other beach residents and denizens, and can harm the fragile beach environment by despoiling dunes, sea grasses, and beach front.</p> <p>Yes, these folks have the right to beach access but only under stringent rules of use. The old saw of "majority rules (beach goers) with protection for the minority (ORV users!)needs to be applied here!</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9060	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	



**Name:** Garcia-Barrio, Constance  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:31:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello:  
Off-road vehicles scar the land and their racket spoils the outdoor experience.  
Constance Garcia-Barrio

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9061    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:31:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Stayed at Cape Hatteras NS in a rental unit many years ago. The park was great outside the boundaries things were changing fast with lots of development. That increase of people brings with it lots more vehicles capable of utilizing the beaches. Vehicles and wildlife aren't a good combination the one usually cancels out the other. Remember the incident in Florida where a vehicle ran over two girls a few years back? That's a possibility worth consideration. All it takes in one knucklehead. The question is who'll benefit the most? My guess is surf fishermen who have the place to themselves for 4-6 months of the year already. Why not keep things that way? I'm sure the wildlife and beachgoers will appreciate the solitude.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9062    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:31:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I try to visit the Outer Banks at least once a year and the off-road and 4-Wheel traffic has become more than a nuisance. I often wonder how long it will be before someone is run over. This area of seashore used to be so pristine and quiet. On some days the traffic is worse on the beach than the main road. Please curtail the off-road/4-wheel use of these fragile areas, as opposed to allowing more. It's better for the beach, the environment, and the people. Make 'em walk!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9063    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:32:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please Protect Cape Hatteras National Seashore and keep ORVs out of the Park. Tks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9064    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Meacham, Thomas S  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a supporter of national parks, I thank you for the chance to comment on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is cherished for its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement favor ORV use over all other uses. This approach fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support Alternative D, the "environmentally preferred" alternative, but it needs to be changed in the following points.  
1) The National Park Service should honor its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife habitat. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) Congress established Cape Hatteras as a park system unit in these words: "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Congress' intent was to protect the visitor experience of wilderness, not ORV use. The NPS must protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9065    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Roy, Joe  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best

examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
 \*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
 Sincerely,  
 Rev. Joe Roy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9066    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Donovan, Phyllis  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:33:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I write you to ask that you keep off-road vehicles off the Cape Hatteras beach shores.  
 First, these vehicles are a sorry excuse for physical exercise, which is so necessary for good health.  
 Second, these vehicles consume gasoline and oil. We should be getting away from our excessive use of this fuel. We don't we use bicycles, or surfboards, or walk?  
 Third, these vehicles are noisy and add to erosion of loose soils.  
 Fourth, what's with this roaring up and down the shoreline...speeding...probably half-drunk....riders mostly over-weight, if not young and rash...and being inconsiderate of other users of the beach, whether human or fowl.  
 For once, put the good of the environment ahead of money. Lead people into being more responsible for their health, their beautiful planet, and each other. You can help do this. Ban off-roads from using the shorelines and beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9067    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 I am a former North Carolina resident so I appreciate the dunes, beaches and natural beauty of Cape Hatteras.  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, connie mores

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9068    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sinacore, Paul  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:33:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9069    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:33:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Pedestrians and wildlife need to trump off-road vehicles. Period.

---

0011340

**Correspondence ID:** 9070    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:34:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off road vehicles off of these pristine beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9071    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:34:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Thank you for listening. N. A. Gangone

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9072    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:34:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep Off- Road Vehicles out of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9073    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:34:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles, or any vehicle unless absolutely necessary, have no place on the Hatteras shoreline Kathy Seabrook

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9074    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Fissinger, Julie C  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:34:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting and designating Cape Hatteras as so special, filled with abundant and endangered wildlife, preserving the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9075    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:34:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow recreational use of off-road vehicles on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I have seen first hand the destruction of other national parks and public lands by these vehicles. The terrain, the flora, and the fauna are all affected. Please be good stewards of the natural resources of our great country. Thank you accepting comments from those who care.  
Sincerely, Ollie Brown

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9076    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:34:59  
**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

0011341

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9077    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hooson, Clare  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:35:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** DONT LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9078    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:35:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Preserve out national parks from harm.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9079    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Manning, Mary F  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:35:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Coastal wildlife systems are typically fragile to start with. The wildlife is already struggling from other environmental threats and CERTAINLY doesn't need to have these vehicles added to the list. LET THEM LIVE!!! Ban the SUV's!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9080    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:35:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The people of North Carolina seek an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.  
The gulf crisis has let us know how important it is to keep our coastal areas safe.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9081    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Adamski, Thomas  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:35:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles are damaging to the environment, consume unnecessary fossil fuels, discourage exercise, and detract from the outdoor experience of all other seashore users. Their use should be sharply restricted or eliminated.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9082    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Reese, Toby  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:35:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have vacationed at Cape Hatteras for many years and I feel that this avtion will ruin the beaches and the dunes that are the only protection from the ocean. We don't need the nosie pollution that goes along with this type of activity. I hope you will not do this for the sake of the people who live there and the wildlife that depend on the ocean and beaches for their survival. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9083    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches.  
I can appreciate that some people prefer to enjoy nature while seated on their off road vehicle (ORV), but rest assured the wildlife and walking visitors do not appreciate such intrusion upon such a cherished place.  
All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Catherine Haug Bigfork MT

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9084    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 15:36:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My husband and I think it is vitally important to keep vehicles off the beaches, especially during nesting season for birds, turtles, crabs, and other beach creatures. Thank you, Mary

**Correspondence ID:** 9085    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:36:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9086    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9087    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,

Jenny Linhoff

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9088	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	White, Judith F					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:37:39					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I love the Cape Hatteras National Seashore!! I'm willing to drive many hours to visit there. Please preserve its beauty AND its peace.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9089	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Bartels, John					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9090	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Little, Irene R					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:38:03					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The Cape Hatteras beaches are sensitive areas for wildlife and for people. Please give greater protection to people and wildlife rather than ORVs.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9091	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:38:39					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	So many of the wildlife species in national parks are on endangered lists and struggling to survive. How can you possibly make the use of vehicles more important than providing these few safe and protected places left for our wildlife so future generations can come to appreciate them? Please do not allow these destructive and dangerous vehicles in National Parks. Please leave these peaceful and tranquil places to be enjoyed without noisy and polluting vehicles and safe for the wildlife.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9092	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Cosgrove, John C					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:39:06					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9093	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 15:39:13					

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have so little pristine, undisturbed environment remaining... why allow it to be torn up and irreparably damaged with off road vehicles? What will the next generation have if we don't preserve what we have?  
 I urge you to bar these vehicles from the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9094    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Groves, Ronald  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:39:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9095    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mitchell, Charles S  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:40:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Given that I favor limiting use of ORVs to official and emergency access only, I offer following principles to underpin the park's formulation of its final plan.  
 We have become a nation of fat people. Riders of ORV's should not be allowed on the Seashore unless they weigh at least 200 pounds less than the vehicles on which they are riding. ORV parking areas should be provided next to the scales on which their riders are weighed, and if the riders are too large they must park their ORV's and be allowed access only as Seashore pedestrians.  
 Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan should ban ORV use in any area regularly frequented by wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species.  
 Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information, which thus far clearly shows that ORVs and wildlife don't get along at all well together. Wildlife disturbance is to be construed to include occasional activities such as breeding among birds and sea turtles.  
 A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery to pre ORV intrusion levels. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need thorough vetting based on the original capacity of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its diminished capacity after ORV intrusion.  
 Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until the Seashore returns to its pristine, undisturbed state.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors, with particular emphasis on the original, non human denizens of, and visitors to, the Seashore.  
 (these comments are loosely based on a sincere but mealymouthed screed by the Audubon Society)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9096    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:40:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Do not allow vehicle use on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches. This delicate environment can be spoiled by noise, petroleum spills, erosion, and wildlife disruption. Protect this pristine environment for the generations to come.  
 Thank you! J. Lohr

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9097    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** ,  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:**

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9098    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:40:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason. "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9099    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:40:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9100    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:40:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9101    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be



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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9102    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9103    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Please help protect our precious wildlife! It is our responsibility!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9104    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9105    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9106    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9107    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Derbigny, Rodney J

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9108    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9109    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9110    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9111    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 9112    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 9113    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 9114    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 9115    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9116    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9117    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9118    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** wajda, Scott P  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is very important to keep our nature areas free of noise and human destruction.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9119    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9120    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:41:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9121    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mathias, Beverly  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Send Your Comments Today!  
**DEADLINE TUESDAY!!**  
(The link above will take you to the National Park Service's Planning, Environment, and Public Comment Site) Dear Beverly,  
**URGENT: 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 advocates--like you--fail to take action, Cape Hatteras National Seashore will be dominated by ORV use for the next 20 years!  
NPCA seeks an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.  
Take Action Now: Submit your comments to the NPS by midnight (Mountain Time), Tuesday, May 11, and urge them 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.  
Here's how to submit your comments to the Park Service:  
1) To comment, please click here. This link will take you to the National Park Service's Planning, Environment, and Public Comment Site. The page you will see displayed is the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS comment page.  
2) After filling in your personal information, simply cut and paste the sample letter below into the NPS comment form; we highly encourage you to add your own comments as well.  
3) After completing the comment form, make sure to click the "Submit" button found at the bottom of the page.  
\*\*\*\*\* Sample Letter  
Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9122    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:43:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9123    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:43:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Thank you for your consideration. --matt goto

**Correspondence ID:** 9124    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:44:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 9125    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:44:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9126    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:44:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9127    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

In past years we have tried to protect the breeding bird population at Hatteras by roping off their nesting areas and hoping folks would respect the "restricted areas". But what do the ORV owners do? They intentionally drive their vehicles over the rope and onto the nesting grounds. And the same for turtle nests. And when a baby bird hatches it doesn't know about "boundaries" and wanders all over the beach. I have seen dead birds in the tracks of ORVs and it makes me sick. Why the Park Service ever allowed vehicles on the beach in the first place is beyond me. Yes, there was a time when there were no vehicles on the beaches and only then did the wildlife have a chance to flourish. I am definitely for banning ORVs on the beaches using the guidelines below.

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

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

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

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

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



Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
Sincerely, Judy Murray 406 Holly Lane Chapel Hill, NC 27517

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9128    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 15:44:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9129    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 15:44:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9130    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 15:44:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

as breeding ones.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9131    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:44:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9132    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:44:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
These types of delicate environments are crucial to the survival of several species. As the recent oil spill in the Gulf has shown, the environment for these species can be devastated in an instant and I would hate to see yet another area affected negatively by people.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9133    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely, Pamela McAdoo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9134    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:44:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off-road vehicles away from the beaches for the sake of noise abatement for people and wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9135    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:44:18**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9136    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Dear Superintendent Murray, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the NPS proposed plan to manage ORV use on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I am extending my support for the identified "environmentally preferred" alternative D when and if it is modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9137    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,07,2010 15:44:18**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9138    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:44:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9139    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:44:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9140    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:44:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9141    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:44:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** WHY would you even consider opening up such a beautiful, calm, quiet environment to obnoxious off road vehicles?? Cape Hatteras National Seashore is there for the wildlife that call it home and for the non-destructive enjoyment of people. There should be NO allowances made for ORVs. There are more people who enjoy the seashore the way it was meant to be enjoyed, than those who wish only to destroy the quiet and beauty by riding around like fools on oversized kids' toys!! Please DO NOT allow this ridiculousness to happen. Cape Hatteras was made a National Seashore to preserve its beauty and to preserve the land for the animals that require it to survive. Why ruin that land now???

Sincerely, Mara Chaiken

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9142    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:45:00  
**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.

R. Lohr

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9143    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Davis, Glenn C  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:45:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please select the option which maximizes the land set aside for wildlife. Sea turtles, sea birds, and some mammals use these beaches for nesting or just as a safe place to pull up and rest.  
Some areas should be restricted solely as wildlife areas. Others can tolerate hiking and beachcombing. Areas set aside for ORV should be limited to areas which are not important for wildlife. The smell and noise from ORV extends far beyond their immediate locations, so they should be limited to very specific and enforceable areas.  
Thank you for taking my views into account.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9144    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** PLATT, KEN  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:45:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I can see no justification for the continuously increasing access of motorized vehicles into the National Park System. It saddens me. May those elective officials who support this be voted out of office.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9145    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:45:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Isn't it time the human race realizes that the Earth doesn't just belong to us, it belongs to every species. How would we like it if animals came roaring through our homes...and our bedrooms (quite a mood-breaker, I bet), yet we feel free to do that to them. And if that included driving over and destroying our homes (nests) and killing our children (eggs)I think we would be pretty upset, yet we free perfectly free to do that to other species. We need to re-think how we treat this planet and here is one small way to do it. Please keep mopeds off the beaches. Thank you for your time and consideration of my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9146    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Best, Bobbie D  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:45:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of

the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9147    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:46:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** off road vehicles destroy fragil habitats for birds and seashore species. There are so few places left in this country that are quiet and peaceful without the sounds of engines.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9148    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Fedorov, Kristina  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:46:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** These beautiful places must stay as undisturbed as possible, to remain as nature intended.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9149    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:46:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Don't let offshore vehicles destroy the beauty that is Cape Hatteras.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9150    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bartell, Frank  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:47:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9151    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:47:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This will be teh beginning of the destruction of this habitat. Let this sites as they are naturally. Sea creatures and also inland could be harm if you let vehicles enter this beautiful areas that are in a great danger and in need of been kept as they are naturally. Once humans try to have their rights aproved then after that the destruction of nature began. Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9152    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Carlson, Parson  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern, As a former motorcycle and ORV mechanic, I am fully aware of the destructive capabilities of ATVs, dirt bikes, snowmobiles, watercraft and the like. These recreational vehicles have their place, but they have no place in our national parks where we are supposed to be preserving nature and wildlife in all its pristine beauty and serenity. There is enuff noise and fast-paced commotion in daily life as it is, but to allow this type of activity is a breach of the intentions of our beloved parks. On top of this is the pollution in the form of exhaust gases which inevitably accompanies these vehicles. Who needs more of this madness? Have not our national parks been designed and wisely set aside for people, including generations to come, to get away from this type of environment? Have we not recently enjoyed the incredible Ken Burns documentary and its undeniable message, that our national parks are meant to be places of escape, solitude, and identification with the wonders of nature? What would John Muir have to say about this recent initiative, or for that matter, Teddy Roosevelt, or many of the other great Americans who were instrumental in the creation of our national park system? And to think that the NPS itself is considering these changes! Another undeniable message from America's Best Idea documentary is the truth that the parks belong to all Americans. As one of them, I strongly urge you to do all you can to prohibit ORVs, ATVs, dirt bikes, snowmobiles, and watercraft from our national parks. Thanks again for considering my comments and for all you do on behalf of out national parks. Parson Carlson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9153    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:49:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We need more wild and if possible, pristine areas that are protected from off road vehicles; places where one can walk or ride a bike in peace and silence. Please protect Cape Hatteras National Seashore for current and future generations.

**Correspondence ID:** 9154    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:49:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sincerely, Michele Bihari

**Correspondence ID:** 9155    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Thomas, J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:50:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Have you seen the coverage of the destruction in the Gulf? Haven't people like you who make the decision to allow more destruction of the natural world seen enough? Why does every beach have to be destroyed? They destroyed the oceans, beaches, islands, reefs, fish, animals, fishing industry in the Gulf. Are you going to allow more destruction?

**Correspondence ID:** 9156    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Aikens, Sonja L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:50:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a supporter and user of national parks, I appreciate 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 family and I travel to various parks on our vacations in order to view scenery and wildlife, hike, camp, etc.  
The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9157    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:50:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras is a unique environmental treasure. There are many problems with allowing Off road vehicles: 1. Environmental damage: vehicles destroy delicate roots, eco-systems, plants, fungus and bacteria that anchor the entire areas larger eco-systems.  
2. Tourism: Nature Tourism is for everyone, not loud machines which destroy the moment of being with nature  
3. Pollution: vehicle exhaust will damage habitat and erode the quality of the experience.  
4. Environmental damage yields eco system damage, a wide spread interconnect among multiple species. Im

**Correspondence ID:** 9158    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
L Marks

P.S. Haven't we done enough harm and destruction to this planet of ours and for such a vain reason as orv's for entertainment!!! Come on, do the right thing-DO NOT ALLOW ORV'S!!!

**Correspondence ID:** 9159    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Frey, Lisa J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:52:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9160    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:52:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9161    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:53:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs;



0011362

I understand that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is being considered as a site for Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) recreational use. I am writing to oppose any such action. Seashores are delicate ecosystems, particularly on barrier islands, and ORV's are notorious for destroying any ecosystem in which they're allowed unrestricted access. There are many areas, construction sites, dumps, etc that are suitable for destructive ORV use... our national seashores are not. Thank you,  
Rael Nidess, M.D. Marshall, TX

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9162    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:53:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
Please protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore!  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9163    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Dimen, Michael  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:53:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9164    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** maisey, catherine  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:54:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras in North Carolina is already beset with storms. Soon more than likely it will be receiving some of the oil carried up from the gulf, off road vehicles are the last thing it needs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9165    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Orr, Joe  
**Received:** May,07,2010 15:54:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, birders, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of

the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9166    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Younger, Nancy M

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:55:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep my state's coast safe and clear for everyone. So little natural habitat is left for people, plants, and other animals. How can we educate the future generations if nothing is left? KEEP NC CLEAN AND OPEN TO ALL. Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 9167    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not allow ORV's to ruin the beauty, the peace and quiet, and the unspoiled habitat at Cape Hatteras. ORV's cause erosion, disturb birds, turtles, and other wildlife, and their noise and pollution make it impossible for pedestrians to enjoy the park. It is the duty of the Park Service to protect park lands from this kind of abuse, and to preserve the natural state of the land.

Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and not allow ORV use if it may cause any harm to wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9168    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Gaines, David

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:55:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep our parks free of off road motorized vehicles. The parks are there for everyone to enjoy. If motorized vehicles are allowed, this will spoil the park for everyone.

**Correspondence ID:** 9169    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Daletski, Anne

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:55:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was there 40 years ago and have many fond memories of this important historical area. To allow off road vehicles in an area of such importance is unreasonable. Let those adults who must play find someplace else to do it.

**Correspondence ID:** 9170    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Bernard, Janice

**Received:** May,07,2010 15:55:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As former visitor to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and, hopefully, a future visitor, I hope you will take seriously the comments I have on this proposal.  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,

Dr. Janice K. Watson-Bernard

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9171	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Hickman, Tammy				
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>I visit our parks for quiet time to enjoy nature - I recognize the rights of those who enjoy ORVs and ask that they have a separate area to do so - which allows the natural habitat to remain undisturbed and people like me to enjoy nature. thank you, tammy hickman</p>				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9172	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A				
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 15:57:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please consider restricting ORV access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore in order to protect wildlife, bird life, and peace and quiet for all humans. Thank you, Bobbye Kopec				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9173	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Every, Sofia				
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 15:57:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9174	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A				
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 15:58:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Keep this natural place natural. NO ORVs.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9175	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p>				

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9176    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches.  
 My family and I are frequent visitors to the Cape Hatteras area, and my wife has remembered camping there and fishing in the surf with her father when she was a child.  
 All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9177    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:00:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9178    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Raymond, Judith A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:01:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Over the road vehicles should only be used in our National Parks for utility purposes. They are absolutely so noisy that any feeling of a natural area is completely undermined by the noise. Our habitat in the National Parks does not identify with that level of noise and it disrupts their habitat. Please use your influence to block the use of over the road vehicles, three wheelers, four wheelers, motorcycles, etc.  
 Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9179    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:01:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The stated goal of the management plan is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources. The DEIS very minimally addresses the intended purpose of the plan. Restrictions to all uses are proposed, however, proposals to incorporate cultural resource and activity use is lacking. The very core of traditional, cultural, and historical use of the seashore includes seine net fishing, recreational fishing and fishing as a means to put "food on the table" for island residents and visitors alike. General beach use focuses on outdoor activities for all generations strengthening the family unit, providing wholesome and social interactivity for our children, as well as healthy alternatives to the ever increasing sedentary indoor, introverted activities that contribute to the increasing national problem of obesity. A huge effort is being expended by our First Lady, Michelle Obama, stressing the need to spend quality family time and provide healthy activities for our children that they may carry forward to future generations (our future leaders) as our

predecessors have instilled upon us. The President has urged fathers to "Be a Dad" to their children, spend time with them. I believe the establishment of our national parks was originally intended to just that -- allow everyone the opportunity and venue to teach children to responsibly utilize and enjoy nature and the outdoors while maintaining a focus on the preservation of our resources and wildlife. We need to balance this protection and preserve use in order to shape and encourage our youth. Alternative A 2007 Interim Plan is a fair and manageable approach to regulation. It provides protection for wildlife and allows access and use. Under that plan disciplinary action for rule violation can be taken to ensure environmental protection. The other alternatives severely restrict use. This final management plan is to be effective for the next 10-15 years with 5 year proposed intervals for review and change. These are not a viable plans due to the very nature of the seashore weather. Each incoming tide brings with it a change to the topography. No one can predict a seashore environment for successful breeding activity from week to week let alone years. This is a moving target. Alternative A 2007 Interim Plan proved to be a workable plan since inception in 1978.

ORV beach use has not been proven to be a significant risk to birds or turtles. Storms and natural predators far outweigh the ORV use risk resulting in the low success rate for breeding non-native birds or successful turtle hatches. ORV recreational activity actually deters predators, without killing them. Is it possible that these predators to birds/turtles control some other undesirable creatures as well, providing a balance in nature? By responsible ORV/pedestrian activity within the seashore beaches, the overgrowth that would encourage the same predators is controlled discouraging and limiting the predation.

On the subject of pets on the beach, I agree with the requirement of leashing to maintain control of the pet in public. However, a six foot leash, particularly while in a stationary position with owner sitting on the beach, is a bit restrictive. I would suggest 10-12' as a more appropriate safety accommodation to the pet's movement to a shaded area.

After reviewing the very lengthy DEIS, I agree with maintaining the Non-Action Alternative A 2007 Interim Plan that incorporated and followed the 1978 draft interim ORV management plan.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely, Bernice Meeker Outer Banks Visitor -- 35+ years

**Correspondence ID:** 9180 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Saldana, Shannon

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:01:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9181 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Dew, Aloma W

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:02:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not allow ATVs on Hatteras beaches. This is an area I have enjoyed many times through the years and it is the solitude and peace and quiet that makes it special. ATVs will cause disruption on delicate beach habitat and create noise pollution as well as emissions. There are other places these vehicles can be used. Please do not destroy our nation's special places with ATV access. Keep our beaches quiet, clean, and safe.

Sincerely,

Aloma Williams Dew 2015 Griffith Place East Owensboro, KY 42301

**Correspondence ID:** 9182 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:02:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** National Recreation Areas, beaches and off road areas, should be kept free of all terrain vehicles, motorcycles, and other motorized devices unless they are emergency service vehicles. These areas are intended to be preserved; if noncustodial or nonemergency vehicles are allowed into areas like these, we will be destroyed. We are custodians of our national parks and recreation areas; they are not intended for indiscriminant uses. There have to be rules to preserve them, and those rules must be enforced. If the areas cannot be patrolled, they cannot be opened for off road vehicle use. If patrolling is so sparse that the intent of the regulation cannot be enforced, then, they should not be opened to off road vehicle traffic. There are some areas that should have no vehicle traffic at all. These should be hiking, backpacking, or horse back areas only. It is difficult to designate exactly what good conservation is. However, we know that motorized or wheeled, animal drawn vehicles make havoc with protected areas. This is more true of recreational vehicles than other vehicles. Responsible use of recreational vehicles is difficult to enforce. No law should be unenforceable, or all law enforcement becomes arbitrary and capricious. Prohibiting vehicles is preferable to permitting vehicles in many instances.

**Correspondence ID:** 9183 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Miller, Toby

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:02:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please let's keep off-road vehicles restricted from Cape Hatteras and other national seashores. There are plenty of other places for them to 'play.' Thank you!

**Correspondence ID:** 9184 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:03:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am vehemently opposed to allowing off road vehicles in Cape Hatteras.

**Correspondence ID:** 9185    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:03:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9186    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cato, Mary E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:03:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9187    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kasdan, Maxann M  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:03:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles must always be regulated. It would be a help to all people on the beaches to have clear rules about what and what not can be done.

**Correspondence ID:** 9188    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:03:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My Wife and I just spent a week on the Outer Banks, While we where there the ocean came up and under the hotel where we were staying. This area is very fragil and off road vehicles will speed up its erosion and eventually be part of Pamlico Sound. It is my impression that although there is quite a bit of public sentiment about protecting the birds over human use this area needs some sort of reduction of heavy use like the off road vehicles to protect the beach from erosion. My personal use of the beach includes walking and enjoying nature with surfing and fishing along the way. THE value of the shallows of pamlico sound to commercial fishing and wildlife is un measreable. The plovers are a poor symbol what is at stake. So work towards protecting the beach and the wildlife and restrict the off road use of the beach.  
Daniel

**Correspondence ID:** 9189    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:03:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We need to do all we can to preserve our national parks, please do not allow off roading here.

**Correspondence ID:** 9190    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to recognize the primacy of non-powered travel, and of the animals and plants that are present.

If I may depart from the "party line", and express a more radical opinion. It seems that the number of relatively "unspoiled" areas in our country is reaching a critical level. I see no logical purpose for motorized travel in these areas. The concept of "enjoying nature" at the wheel of an ORV, snowmobile or jet ski is a joke. Motorized travel for pleasure is generally about the thrill of speed and noise, and has nothing to do with the terrain that is being abused. I am both a walker and hiker, and a cyclist, and recognize that even at the relatively slow (quiet, and self-powered) speeds that I travel as a cyclist completely changes how I experience the terrain I travel through.

It is time to treat the few remaining wild areas with the respect they deserve - and remove access to motorized "thrill travel" from them.

sincerely,  
ronald long

**Correspondence ID:** 9191    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Phillips, Chip

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:04:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose allowing off-road vehicles on the beaches of Cape Hatteras. The disruption in terms of noise, pollution and damage to the terrain is totally unacceptable.

**Correspondence ID:** 9192    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Brady, Kevin

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:05:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely, Kevin Brady

**Correspondence ID:** 9193    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:05:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** DON'T LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!

**Correspondence ID:** 9194    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without impacting the primary pedestrian experience and without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

0011369

In light of the negative effects of our country's dependence on oil, I personally feel ORVs should be discouraged in all national parks. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9195    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:06:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** What should be uppermost is the purpose these parks are set aside to provide. There are fewer and fewer places that people can go that are unspoiled by noise and pollution. We should make every effort to preserve what is left.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9196    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:06:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The NPS is responsible for protecting this fragile area. Stop catering to the money interests and adhere to your responsibilities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9197    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Adornato III, John  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:06:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the approval of off-road vehicles on Cape Hatteras. The damage to wildlife habitat - sea turtles and wading/migratory birds is not worth the ability for a few people to drive on this beach. National parks are a treasure we shouldn't disrespect with ORVs; indeed it is these few areas where we should provide a heightened level of protections.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9198    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:06:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
I'm a member of National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks. My comments are 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 conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D.  
The proposed ORV plan for Cape Hatteras takes far too much of the Cape for noise and exhaust polluting vehicles. As US population grows places of peace, beauty, quiet and clean air become ever more precious. Please leave much more of the Cape as the "primitive wilderness" Congress meant it to be.  
Sincerely,  
Sheila Lodge

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9199    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:08:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep all motorized vehicles off of these precious beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9200    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:09:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't allow off road vehicle on cape hatteras national seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9201    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Neff, Jeffrey A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:09:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the proposal to allow more recreational vehicle use in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I feel that our seashore wildlife need this undisturbed space for breeding and life more than we do for recreation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9202    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:09:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** You need to eliminate the access by ORVs to this area based on the damage that has been done and the decrease in the various wildlife species that see this area for habitat.  
ORV users are a very vocal MINORITY who have chosen to take access to whatever they can regardless of environmental issues.  
They need to be stopped. They need to have their own areas of access paid for with their own license fees. They are way too intrusive on other users access.  
They are NOT berry pickers/family outing people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9203    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:10:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow the Cape Hatteras National Seashore to be taken over by ORV users. Their use of the area precludes all other uses and makes it impossible to accommodate the needs of wildlife and people who could enjoy the area in many other ways. Their usage is destructive and causes damage that can perhaps never be repaired. Please adopt the modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement.



<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9204	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:10:10						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9205	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Chandler, Leonard B						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:10:53						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Off-road vehicles must only be allowed in limited areas of National Parks. Those areas should be limited to where any possible environmental damage will be least likely to occur.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9206	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:10:58						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9207	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:10:59						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p> <p>We as HUMANE beings should do all that we can to protect and preserve lesser creatures, after all this is THEIR Earth too.</p>						

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9208	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 16:10:59						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The original intent in making this area a park should be honored -- even now. It is even more important to honor that now because so many other areas are no longer beautiful, saved, parks honoring the Earth and the people on it.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9209	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 16:11:02						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I oppose the impact it will have on the park, animals and vegetation.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9210	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 16:11:04						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9211	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 16:11:04						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9212	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 16:11:09						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are</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 recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9213    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:11:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9214    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:11:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9215    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:11:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9216    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:11:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9217    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

As a resident of this state, I would love to be able to take my grand children and great grandchildren to this marvelous piece of history and wildlife so that they, too, can appreciate nature's beauty and diversity. Please help all of the citizens of not only North Carolina but of the world to hold on to these most precious resources that are left to us. We have a responsibility to care for God's creatures, not destroy them.

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

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

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

Please help save this most precious part of the world. The future of all depend on your actions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9218    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:11:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9219    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:11:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9220    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:11:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9221    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:11:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9222    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:11:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating,

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9223    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:11:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9224    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:11:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9225    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:11:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9226    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:11:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9227    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:11:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9228    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:11:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9229    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, Please read and consider carefully the meaning of the points made in the letter that follows. We have so much work to do in keeping all of our parks carefully protected as our human population increases and places for recreation decrease. The plants and animals in these sacred places are sacred, also. I hope you will head this and not allow ORV's endanger these areas.  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: 9230 Project: 10641 Document: 32596
Name: Forbes, William
Received: May,07,2010 16:11:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I recommend the strictest possible regulations for ORVs on national seashores. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 9231 Project: 10641 Document: 32596
Name: fisher, john
Received: May,07,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I was last in the Cape Hatteras area some forty years ago. It was a beautiful and wild region. There is absolutely no excuse to introduce ORVs into this environment. john.fisher.jgfisher@pacbell.net

Correspondence ID: 9232 Project: 10641 Document: 32596
Name: Bruce, Donald E
Received: May,07,2010 16:11:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Correspondence ID: 9233 Project: 10641 Document: 32596
Name: Couch, Sandra L
Received: May,07,2010 16:12:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off road vehicles need to be kept out of all parks and natural areas where wild animals are trying to live a life without humans interference!!!!!!! DO YOU WANT A LOUD POLLUTING MACHINE TWICE OR THREE TIMES THE SIZE OF YOUR HOME DRIVING THRU THE MIDDLE OF YOUR LIVING ROOM OR BEDROOM AT ALL HOURS WITHOUT ANY CONCERN OF WHERE YOU ARE OR WHETHER YOU WILL BE HIT??????????? No vehicles of any kind should be allowed in parks and natural habitats of animals!! No motorcycles, no motor homes, no trailers, no motor vehicles of any type, no gasoline powered vehicle, should be allowed in any park or natural habitat for animals!! Only on foot hiking trails, and bike paths should be allowed in parks and natural habitats for animals.

Correspondence ID: 9234 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y
Name: private
Received: May,07,2010 16:12:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please continue to separate and preserve areas that are vehicle free, for pedesrians. Quietude is hard to come buy, and it's not of dire importance for vehicles to be allowed access to another area, where they can pollute and be disruptive. However, it is of dire importance to protect the ecological balance and wild life found in the Hatteras Beach area. Francine Brown



<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9235	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:12:31						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras National Seashore deserves to be keep in as pristine and close to natural state as possible - Off road vehicles do not belong there and would ruin the visiting experience for the general public.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9236	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Baley, Patricia M						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:12:32						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Our human impact on this wonderful place must be kept to a minimum to preserve its lovely character. ORVs present would degrade the beauty of Cape Hatteras and damage the life that deserves to flourish there unmolested.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9237	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:12:37						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Please preserve Cape Hatteras beaches.</p> <p>I am tired of the selfishness of people who think they have the right to go anywhere they please and ultimately destroy habitat. I support alternative plan D with the stipulation that it asserts NPS authority to manage the wildlife resources. Please preserve this area as wilderness. Allow visitors to enjoy it as God intended.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9238	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:13:05						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The use of ORVs on this beautiful stretch of coastline is truly unconscionable and should be absolutely reconsidered. The public lands are just that, for the public but not at the expense of the wildlife and the natural beauty that has taken years to develop by the careful hand of mother nature..						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9239	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Dohearty, Tom						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p> <p>Sincerely, Tom Dohearty</p>						

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9240	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:13:10						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."</p> <p>Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p> <p>Sincerely, Tonya Hodge</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9241	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Bakke, Susan						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:13:24						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Motor vehicles should not be allowed on public beaches, period.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9242	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:13:42						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."</p> <p>Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9243	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:13:47						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Beaches and wilderness are places Americans go to get away from the sounds and pressures of everyday life. We should be free to connect with nature in these special places, and we should NOT have to contend with the roar of off-the-road vehicles, nor the way they tear up the beaches. Sand with deep tire tracks is not conducive to tranquility. Today's life is strenuous enough, without having the same noises, traffic, and other distractions when we go to the ocean to retrieve a different perspective on life.</p> <p>Please do not allow ORVs on our beaches. Ronken Lynton</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9244	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:13:54						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Pedestrians and wildlife do not mix with motorized vehicles, especially on a constant basis. I can only condone an extremely limited amount of vehicle use, including a speed limit and only at restricted times of the week.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9245	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9246    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:14:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9247    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:14:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.  
 Please consider future generations--of wildlife to be around for our grandchildren. Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9248    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:14:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9249    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:14:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9250    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:14:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9251    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:14:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9252    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:14:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9253    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

I believe the above reflects the mission of the national park service and certainly how I would want them managed. Please put careful thought into your approach to this rare treasure you have in your hands. I think with what is happening in the Gulf of Mexico we all are very aware of how we depend on the coast for the livelihood of fishermen, tourists who come for the beauty and wildlife of the beach, and the safe harbor of all creatures who mate and reproduce on these shores to replenish our bounty.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9254    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:14:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9255    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:14:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9256    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which is important to me. For too long, we have allowed special interests to run rampant over our wild areas because they have the money to lobby & protest to get what they want, at the expense of earth's treasures.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Planners regularly underestimate the actual space needed by wild animals & birds to live, forage, breed, & feel safe.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. Even though I live across the country, on the west coast, we face similar problems here regarding beach use & wildlife issues. I feel that our Pacific Coast states are much more aware of wildlife issues & are doing a better job of protecting what we have. I hope you will realize how important these issues are. Once a species is reduced to dangerous levels, recovery is sometimes impossible, leading to possible extinction in the near future. You have a chance now to keep that from happening. Just keep the ORV's OFF the beaches; they can go somewhere else. The noise, fumes, disruption of sensitive vegetation, terrorizing wildlife, etc. are things that need to be avoided, not tolerated for the pleasure of a chosen few. Our national heritage is for all to enjoy, & it doesn't take a motorized, environmental wreckage machine to do it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9257    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 16:14:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

This latest environmental tragedy, the oil leaking into the Gulf, demonstrates yet again how fragile our environment is and how "safeguards" can fail. Why take the risk of UNBALANCING the natural ecosystem?

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9258    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

We stopped going to Yellowstone in the winter because of the snowmobiles in the park. If you allow ORVs to use the beaches on Cape Hatteras National Seashore we will have to look elsewhere for piece and quiet.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a treasure, please do not let be over run by folks you simply want another place to drive their ORVs.

Thank you,  
 Claude Hayn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9259    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Linarez , KJ  
**Received:** May.07.2010 16:14:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

**Correspondence ID:** 9260    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Rosenkotter, Barbara  
**Received:** May.07.2010 16:14:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9261    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 16:14:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please decrease the use of Off Road Vehicles on the Cape Hatteras Shore. The beaches should be prioritized for wild life (such as the turtles), and pedestrian use.  
Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 9262    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sharon Bramblett

**Correspondence ID:** 9263    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Merrill, Lawrence O  
**Received:** May.07.2010 16:14:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with



its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan

**Correspondence ID:** 9264    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:15:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9265    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:15:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In light of the massive oil spill and other disasters, not to mention rapidly changing climate conditions effecting sea and shore life, we must do everything in our power to protect areas needed by these embattled creatures. There are other places for ORV to range - not in this important natural habitat.

**Correspondence ID:** 9266    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:16:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Cape Hatteras Park for people and wildlife only.

**Correspondence ID:** 9267    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:16:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9268    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:16:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9269    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** vogler, robin l  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Robin Vogler

**Correspondence ID:** 9270    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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 for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9271    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Leonard, Richard L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:18:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Off-road vehicle travel must be very carefully considered and controlled. Your job is to protect the environment and wildlife, NOT to destroy it. Practise that!!!! RDLLeonard

**Correspondence ID:** 9272    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:18:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is very important, and a legacy to our children, that off-road vehicles not be allowed on hithertofore protected beaches.

**Correspondence ID:** 9273    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** leitch, mary  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:18:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
 \*\*\*\*\* 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.

**Correspondence ID:** 9274    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:19:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep these natural places pristine and uncomplicated. Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 9275    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:19:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9276    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically declared that "Except for 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 . Frankly, I would prefer to see ORV use allowed only for official park vehicles carrying out the work of the Park Service to protect the ara.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must 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, O.J. Sikes

**Correspondence ID:** 9277    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Telgarsky, Kim  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:19:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Help save the turtles

**Correspondence ID:** 9278    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Petsitis, Jamie  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:19:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There are so few free spaces in this country and we are edging out wildlife and important habitat at every opportunity. Please do not allow this policy to continue with that kind of opportunism. Protecting our beaches and wetlands will ultimately save human beings in the long run.

**Correspondence ID:** 9279    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Collins, Ann J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:19:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Ann J. Collins

**Correspondence ID:** 9280    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Voitik, Terri E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,

**Correspondence ID:** 9281    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association AND an avid 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 located, as you are aware, on the Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area has been enjoyed & cherished by many people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. ALL of the alternatives in the drafted environmental impact statement favor ORV use over all others.  
Overall, I feel that this approach is shortsighted, unbalanced MOST importantly - fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that the Parks should be protecting & which make this area nationally significant.  
Of the plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERRED" Alternative - ITEM D, with the stipulation that it be modified to include and recognize the following points.

0011390

1) The National Park Service MUST NOT ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors (and especially wildlife and the habitat on which it depends). Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife MUST take precedence over One Form of Recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, I understand that it was designated as a park since it meets certain criteria: "Except for 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 ruling was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, NOT singular, limited use. It feel that is absolutely ESSENTIAL that protections are upheld for the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras. I would like to restrict ALL ORV access, however, understand that others would like to use the park, so perhaps limited ORV use would be allowed ONLY if no harm is done to 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 allowing me to present my viewpoint. I am grateful for the efforts of everyone involved with the National Park Service - the stewards of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9282    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:22:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not allow off-road vehicles to destroy the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The mission of the National Park Service is to PRESERVE our national treasures while making them available for safe public recreation. Noise and pollution are not safe.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9283    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:22:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have enough destruction of natural habitat. Can we PLEASE save something in it's natural state that we can enjoy now, as well as for future generations? Those off-road vehicles should be relegated to areas that they've already destroyed and not given free range to destroy whatever is left. It's called a 'natural preserve' not a 'preserve slotted for destruction'. I can't even believe that these issues come up. Who is protecting our natural habitat?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9284    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Skinner, Russell  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:23:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** They should not be on the beach period

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9285    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:24:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please DO NOT allow off-road vehicle usage on Cape Hatteras. The area is so sensitive and must be preserved. Please, please, please do not allow this. Nancy Zalewski

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9286    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:24:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is incomprehensible to me how one can even consider opening up another fragile habitat to off road vehicles. It has been obvious for a long time that the sort of knuckleheads that like this sort of thing (driving really fast and recklessly in, or on, unspoiled areas) get some kind of prurient thrill out of disturbing the peace and killing as many small critters as they can. The type of evil that enjoys loud engines and the thrill of potential death should be kept to their little sandboxes as far from nature and society as possible. Do not give them this small bit of wild to destroy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9287    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** DAnna, Marie  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:25:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Regards, Marie D'Anna

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9288    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:25:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please!!!! DON'T LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!

**Correspondence ID:** 9289    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Chris Watson Program Manager, Southeast Region

**Correspondence ID:** 9290    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Williams, James H  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:25:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

As a former NPS ranger, current VIP, and frequent visitor to national park areas, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft EIS for Cape Hatteras. I urge the NPS to adopt a modified version of alternative D, which the service admits is the environmentally desirable alternative. The executive summary to the EIS makes clear the following important points:

1. The enabling legislation for the park stresses wilderness management of the seashore with a few exceptions for recreation, namely "swimming, boating, sailing, fishing, and other recreational activities of [a] similar nature." Clearly, driving automobiles up and down a fragile beach ecosystem neither qualifies as an appropriate "recreational activity" nor as a compatible activity with those activities expressly mentioned, such as swimming, which requires pedestrian use of the beach. I would assert that had Congress imagined motorized driving on the beach in 1937, it would have specifically mentioned it as an acceptable form of recreation. Cars, after all, did exist in 1937, and no doubt Americans were driving them, trucks, tractors, motorcycles, and whatever else they could on American beaches.

2. The EIS admits that current restrictions on beach driving have failed to halt the decline of bird populations and beach habitats. "Managing" motor vehicles on the beaches does not prevent damage. I am sure that there is not 24-hour surveillance of beach activities that prevents every driver from straying into prohibited areas or inflicting damage on fragile ecosystems. Therefore, it seems simplest to me to prohibit beach driving altogether, for it is neither an appropriate recreational activity nor one that is compatible with the Organic Act's mandate to preserve areas unimpaired for future generations.

It would appear to me that the NPS has chosen alternative F for political reasons. By this I mean so as not to raise a ruckus with the ORV people and industry, or to please influential local politicians. When the NPS does not choose the alternative that it admits is best for the environment (D) and seek to prohibit "recreation" that endangers wildlife, plant life, and human visitors on foot, I say it is a crying shame. You're creating another Yellowstone snowmobile scenario with undoubtedly endless lawsuits and draft EIS plans under even more court orders. Wouldn't it be best to let science and Congressional intent drive your decisions rather than seeking to please a tiny interest group that sees it as a right to plow up public, nationally-significant beaches in Jeeps?

**Correspondence ID:** 9291    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Roether, Richard  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:25:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best

examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,  
Richard W Roether

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9292	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Ausura, Robert V					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:26:43					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I love the Cape Hatteras beaches. I have been a summer vacationer there for almost twenty years, and now two of my three adult sons are regular visitors there as well. What is wonderful about Cape Hatteras is its level of preservation. It is a wonderful place for walking, exploring, observing wildlife and finding that most elusive of treasures in this bustling nation: peace.</p> <p>Congress designated Cape Hatteras a National Park system asset with the provision that, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." What this means to me is that off-road vehicles need not be entirely prohibited but must be restricted to areas of the park where they pose minimal threat to the environment and minimal disturbance to visitors there to enjoy the park as it has been preserved in accordance with Congress's directive.</p> <p>Please consider carefully any decision to allow ORVs onto Cape Hatteras. There are hundreds of areas -- and more and more every year -- where ORV owners can already ride to their hearts' content, so adding Cape Hatteras to their list would be of little consequence to them But there are, every year, fewer and fewer places where people like me and my family can go and find refuge from recreational machinery.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9293	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:26:53					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9294	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:27:06					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>Please save the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. ORVs have no reason to be on a beach anywhere. They only serve to erode the terrain, kill important vegetation, and kill and terrorize the wildlife. Our seashores are precious and should be interacted with on a more personal level which an ORV zooming across the terrain does not allow. Please adopt the 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.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9295	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that</p>					

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* 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,  
Lenore I. Nieters

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9296    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Stone, Maria R  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:27:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9297    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Fourman, Mrs. Marlin  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:28:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
It is very important to keep beaches & seashore for everyone. We only have so much land! As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9298    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:28:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D,



if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9299    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Haney, Sid L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:29:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Our beaches, park lands,"public lands" are for everybody. Take only pictures leave onlu footprints.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9300    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:29:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** no guns no vehicles no alcohol, if you cant take nature on its terms then stay home.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9301    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:29:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** DONT LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!  
PLEASE don't 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. The wildlife and seashore cannot be repaired or replace like a light bulb. We must use wisdom and care to protect what we cannot replace.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9302    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bosma, Tyler  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:29:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do NOT approve off-road vehicle use for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. This park is a national treasure, and its pristine natural beauty should be saved for the wildlife that need it and pedestrian visitors.  
Please protect the endangered species that call this seashore home.  
Sincerely, Tyler Bosma Seattle, WA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9303    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:30:17  
**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:** 9304    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:30:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely, Kristin Howard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9305    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 16:30:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off road vehicles and all other vehicles off the beaches and away from Cape Hatteras.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9306    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Walzer, Edward P  
**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 any form of recreation, and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9307    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 16:30:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9308    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hart, Nancy G  
**Received:** May.07,2010 16:30:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** If you don't protect the beach now it will vanish to never be replaced!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9309    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cox, Millicent  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:31:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. 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 all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Millicent Cox

**Correspondence ID:** 9310    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:31:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9311    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wigand, Sunni  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Sunni Wigand

**Correspondence ID:** 9312    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Eckert, Hugh

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:33:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do what you can to limit offroading on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The noise and pollution are bad enough, but the damage to the dunes makes it even worse.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9313    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:33:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9314    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:33:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in full support of this project.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9315    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:33:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles would spoil a national treasure, destroying priceless and irreversible habitat, and ruining the toxic-free enjoyment of the public. Why sponsor more petroleum use, smog, and destruction when people could walk?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9316    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Blackeagle, Cory  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a avid supporter of and visitor to 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 use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must 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) Though an ORV user is not inconvenienced nor disturbed by foot travelers, the reverse is not true. People who choose foot travel do so to escape the noise and confusion and pollution motorized traffic brings. ORVs will irreparably damage the solitude that Cape Hatteras provides to those seeking a tonic for the stress of daily life. I and the multitude of national park visitors like me do not choose to walk or hike where motorized traffic frequents. Consequently, I choose to go elsewhere. Since the establishing legislation for Cape Hatteras specifically indicated that the area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness, ORV useage strictly excluded.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Be Well! Cory Blackeagle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9317    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Collins, Carol L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:35:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9318    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:35:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9319    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:35:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9320    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Goller, Leslie A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a supporter of national parks and a frequent user of the beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore since I was a child (over 40 years), I submit these comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore ("Cape Hatteras").

All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement ("draft") privilege ORV use over all other visitors. This is wrong. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its undeveloped sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods. This area is cherished precisely because of this and as a national treasure it must be preserved. Of the 6 alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, IF it is modified to include and is modified to recognize the following critical points:

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its legal responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect

ALL visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife legally takes precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." ORVs will not leave the resource unimpaired- it is an impossibility which is blatantly evidenced by those beaches which have not banned it.

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor's experience of a primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor's experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if and where it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. A primitive wilderness experience does not include the noise and fumes generated by ORVs.

3) The final Plan/EIS must 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 hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan for Cape Hatteras.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9321    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Landeo, Eva  
**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. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9322    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:36:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** with climate change, wildlife is having a harder and harder time. We are in the midst of the largest number of species extinction since the dinosaurs disappeared. please prioritize wildlife over human recreation

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9323    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** goldman, steven  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:36:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9324    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:36:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The wildlife habitat destruction that would come from ORV use would be irreversible; these barrier islands also protect the mainland from storms and tide damage. ORV use would destabilize the fragile environment and risk permanent destruction for normal natural human and animal use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9325    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bailey, Therold E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:37:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** ORV's scar the landscape, degrade the environment, promote erosion, pollute the air, create ghastly noise, and make a general nuisance. Please consider the environment and users other than ORV operators and keep ORV's out of NPS lands and areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9326    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:37:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9327    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Padgett, Judith K  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:37:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9328    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:37:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel as though the wildlife should be of the greatest importance in this situation. I do not object to people being able to use ORV's in the park, but I don't think they should be allowed to overrun the animals and pedestrians. I believe they should be kept separately from the pedestrians. Thank you, Eugenna

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9329    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:38:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The times that I have been to the Outer Banks are among the most memorable of my life.  
I hope to continue to have access to the beaches and enjoy the rare solitude and magnificent beauty.  
I also hope that cars, SUVs and trucks will not be in view. I want the beautiful, natural, rare environment that I know as the Outer Banks. And I want this for others who do, or would, love this beauty. I speak for them, also.  
Thank you for this consideration.  
Donna

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9330    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sliptchuik, Claire  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:38:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** You'll be sorry...people will die and who will accept the blame. I live in FLA and in Daytona you can drive on the beach - what a messy disaster and someone recently died - run over while sunbathing.  
Oil and gas will leak and who's going to clean it up?  
Don't do it...!!! Keep it pristine.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9331	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:38:55						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not let off road vehicles ruin the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. There are plenty of places for ORV's that don't require ruining nationally protected seashores and monuments.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9332	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9333	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Barnett, Brittany H						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:39:29						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>As a Wildlife Biologist, I am writing to remind you that there is no other place on earth like Cape Hatteras. I have grown up visiting these beaches every summer and to think that they are in danger of becoming webs of ORV trails is very alarming to me. The multitude of perfectly preserved ecosystems and the level of biodiversity is unique to this area of the world and we must continue to keep it this way. There are thousands of animals who depend on these seashores for survival and thousands of tourists and families who come each year to enjoy nature at it's finest. I am concerned that you can not foresee the travesty of allowing ORV access to this beautiful place. Please take a moment to weigh the losses and I hope you will come to the conclusion that ORV destruction does not belong at Cape Hatteras. Those who enjoy off road vehicle sports will have to understand that we can not risk losing the wildlife and the unspoiled habitats for the sake of human entertainment. If you're going to allow this kind of destruction then you might as well throw in an amusement park and a 20 acre parking lot. Maybe some strip malls and definitely some neon lights just so that the wildlife know that once again humans have conquered and destroyed their only home. Of the 6 alternative plans in the draft, I support the "environmentally preferred" alternative D. However, you must remember to always put wildlife needs before human desires. Also, keep in mind that Congress declared this seashore be a protected primitive wilderness and not a protected ORV park. Most important, you must give full wildlife management authority to NPS, because they are the only ones who will not act for selfish reasons. Thank yo for making the right decision. Brittany Barnett</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9334	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Bolman, Diane						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:39:50						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep off-road vehicles out of Cape Hateras.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9335	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:40:10						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>In many areas of the country, regardless of written guidelines and even laws, a significant percentage of Off Road Vehicles seem to destroy the environment in which they recreate. Here, near my home, instead of using the designated areas, they "create" new roads in forests, tearing up flora and destroying crucial wildlife habitat. In many beach areas around the world, horses aren't even allowed on beaches because of the potential for damage and erosion.</p> <p>Instead of learning from others' experience, you're seeking to disproportionately dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors. Preserving the area as "primitive" is your mandate and that is inconsistent with allowing rampant ORV destruction for the next 20 years.</p> <p>Please reconsider and rewrite the plan to protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9336	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Cohen, Andrew M						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:40:40						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Keep the off road vehicles off the Hatteras dunes! This is fragile territory. It is breeding ground for birds, turtles, certain fish and shell fish, all of which are potentially threatened by the Gulf oil spill to begin with. If this fragile ecosystem is to sustain and recover from what has already damaged it, it must						



be left out of the industrial loop. That means no off road vehicles. Not some, not a few, none.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9337	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Cox, Chadwick					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:40:50					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I can think of no better way to spread invasive plants on a National Seashore than to allow ORV access to it. In addition to what they bring in, they can go anywhere, gathering plant parts and distributing those parts over the whole area. Surely there are plenty places they can go that are already so disturbed that they will do little additional harm. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is not a place that should allow ORVs.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9338	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:40:51					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Here we go again. giving in to commercial pressure to destroy irreplaceable public land. With guns now allowed on Park lands and OTVs, you have the potential of a good old western recreation. My GOD, when will you realize that these LANDS are so precious that they MUST be preserved. This will destroy them. SEE Utah.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9339	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:40:54					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Always protect wildlife					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9340	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:41:02					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9341	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:41:08					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9342	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which					

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

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

Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. My own preference is to keep all non-lifeguard or naturalist-related vehicles off the beach entirely, or at most to allow access in one or two places for handicapped fishermen.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9343    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:41:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9344    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
We use the Hatteras beaches in summer, and greatly enjoy being able to use vehicles to get out to such places as the point at the Cape. I've heard that birds and such that were killed while under protection were run over by people working for state wildlife agencies, although I can't vouch for the accuracy of this. We don't mind staying out of the roped-off areas, and always take care to do so. If it's possible to provide easier access with vehicles without overly affecting wildlife, it would definitely be nice. Fishermen tend to be people who respect the land and wildlife, and people who can't behave themselves in this regard should be disciplined.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9345    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:41:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9346    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 16:41:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9347    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 16:41:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9348    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 16:41:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9349    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:41:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9350    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:41:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9351    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:41:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9352    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:41:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9353    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gillanders, David  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:41:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Beaches like Cape Hatteras should be for walking or sitting quietly and enjoying nature not for loud off road vehicles to disturb the peace and quiet and rip up the beach. Please seek to setup 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:** 9354    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:41:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9355    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:41:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9356    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:41:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9357    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:41:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow Off Road Vehicle use at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It will destroy the beauty of a national treasure and ruin it for pedestrian visitors and for wildlife. It would be a terrible shame!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9358    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. I have been a regular visitor to the Outer Banks for 35 years, and I have been a wildlife rehabilitation volunteer in Maryland for 8 years.

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

Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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:** 9359    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:41:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9360    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

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

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

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

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

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones f

**Correspondence ID:** 9361    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me  
As a property owner on the Delaware shore, I know that action that was taken here by numerous groups and individuals has been successful in benefiting our wildlife. More than just 16 miles of the beach needs to be protected! It makes no sense to worry about the next generation's future in other ways, if we do not protect these things that provide beauty in their world.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use must be allowed within the park, at should be shared fairly with non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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 preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
And we should be protecting migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 9362    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 16:41:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9363    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 16:41:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9364    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:41:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
These are some very rare animals. If they're gone, then I won't forgive those that killed them off. They're very important for the ecosystem.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9365    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:41:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9366    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Salamon, Linda K  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Don't people have enough places to drive gas guzzling vehicles around, using up foreign oil & spewing carbon monoxide, without allowing them to do so in our National Parks & Beaches? ORV do not have a place in Cape Hatteras. The intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use.  
The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant.  
I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points:  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for 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 very much.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9367    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Nelson, Katharine L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form



**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely Katharine Nelson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9368    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:42:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** cape hatteras must be protected

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9369    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Sheila Winfrey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9370    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:43:17  
**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.

0011411

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9371    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:43:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles have ruined enough of public land. Walking is a fine activity and does not harm the site, nor foul the air, land and water as ATVs do! Limit access to emergency vehicles only.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9372    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:43:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We don't need off road vehicles at our Cape Hatteras National Seashore. They do not belong to be at our Seashore ever.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9373    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:44:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9374    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:44:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9375    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:44:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9376    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:44:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9377    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:44:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9378    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:44:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9379    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:44:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9380    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:44:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9381    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:44:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9382    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:44:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9383    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:44:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9384    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:44:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9385    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:44:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
The health of the environment and its wildlife should come first, at Cape Hatteras.  
Secondly, the natural, non-machine, low impact enjoyment of its natural heritage by humans.  
Our nation has gone much too far in its exploitation and abuse of nature. Our duty as Americans, as citizens of the planet is to preserve what is left, and begin to restore what we have damaged.  
If you want one more reason -- frankly, the health and peace of mind of Americans will be improved, the more we get out of noisy motor vehicles and quietly onto our feet.  
Thank you for hearing from a fellow American.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9386    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:44:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9387    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. I have been in places where it was just me and nature and then all of a sudden a four wheeler appears on the same pathway I am on. The vehicle was loud and it's fumes stunk. The peace that I felt was gone. What is the point of having these beautiful places to visit if they are filled with noisy, stinky vehicles? One of the main reason's people go to these places is to get away from the pressures of life so that they can clear their minds and rejuvenate themselves. Seeing the animals is part of the tranquility. These vehicles will scare them away and/or cause a lot of stress which in turn, may decrease their populations.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9388    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Saunders, Marilyn

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Marilyn Saunders

**Correspondence ID:** 9389    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Ken Shepley

**Correspondence ID:** 9390    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Forman, Maurice E

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:45:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Superintendent Murray,

I'm one of the millions of Americans who have enjoyed the Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches, including, particularly, the unique ecosystem. Each time we return, however, the area demonstrates increasing wear and tear from visitors, with attendant changes in the ecologic balance of shore, plants, and animals.

Some of this, of course, cannot be avoided, and remains the opportunity cost of human activity and presence. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association, I'm very appreciative of the chance to submit my concerns in comments regarding the proposed draft of an Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for the area.

You, more than most, know how unique and valued the Cape Hatteras Seashore is as one of our nationally significant resources. The shore's beaches, salt marshes, and woodlands also have an international reputation and acclaim: Not only Americans seek the native and natural environment travel to the area with gentle enjoyment as the purpose.

That's why I'm surprised and disappointed to learn that all of the draft environmental impact statement alternatives favor off-road vehicle users and use above all other visitors and uses. ORV seems, to an alarming degree, more than merely favored: I agree with statements characterizing the draft alternatives presenting an unbalanced future in which the human, exploitative, and destructive activities will be promoted.

As we're aware in other resources allowed to be ruled, even transiently by ORV and similarly destructive technology, the ecosystem fares poorly. Specifically, the very wilderness which initially draws the visitors, including the ecology of the plants, animals, and land is endangered, even to the extent of destruction.

Draft alternative "D" is the only one of the proposals which comes close to a balanced and ecologically sustaining for us and the environment. I agree with the suggestion that inclusion of three conceptual goals and objectives could do more than merely salvage the EIS.

First, I urge conservation of the entire Cape Hatteras shoreline for future generations, with particular emphasis upon protecting its wildlife habitat. Further, in opposition to the other 5 proposals, this conservation effort must be given precedence when planning and allowing, not to mention promoting any recreational use not consistent with the unimpaired preservation of the ecosystem for enjoyment by future visitors, even beyond our own lifetime. Secondly, we must note and take into account that our national primitive and natural wilderness resources are becoming increasing rare and endangered directly and indirectly. The few remaining should be designated and treated so as to preserve them with the goal of perpetuity. The economic, biologic, and even medical reasons for this principle should require no further discussion in light of recent discoveries which are aiding humans.

And, finally, in order to preserve and protect the area, the Park Service needs the responsibility and authority to monitor, study, and responsibly manage the wildlife resources of the entire area. Without a management information system that results in goal enforcement activity there is no value to the objectives I lay out above.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Those in America's future, when visiting one of the most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore, its sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and wilderness will be grateful for your action today.

Sincerely and respectfully,  
M. Earl Forman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9391    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Nordgren, Ronald  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:45:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. I hope to visit Cape Hatteras someday and hike the beaches without getting buzzed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9392    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:45:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please restrict off road vehicles from the beach. Their noise pollution, and their actual bodies disturb the natural wildlife found in that area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9393    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Boone, Linda A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:45:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Outer Banks are so beautiful and serene and have such a mystery of relative isolation. If off road vehicles are allowed there, the place will be totally spoiled. LEAVE it alone as it is. People who appreciate and respect the area will continue to use it - those who just want to make noise and go fast should go elsewhere.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9394    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.



<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9395	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Lockwood, Mary L				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:46:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The sounds and sights and aromas of the beach areas should be that of nature. We get enough of the noise and smells and dodging 'motor traffic' in the cities. The beach should be a safe place for humans and non-human wildlife. Coastal regions are under enough stress caused by man. Natural beach structures are beautiful in themselves without having tire tracks added...even though the wind and surf will dull their effect. I can see the park service using vehicles to perform their duties, but visitors need to have extremely limited motor vehicle access. (Park and Ride in some areas?) I want to hear the surf, feel the wind, smell the salt air, and hear the birds and the surf. Thank you!				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9396	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:48:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9397	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Borowiak, Natasha				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:49:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9398	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 16:50:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a community activist and member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks,(Former Vice Chair of NPS's Santa Monica Mountains National Recreational Area Advisory Commission) I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the				

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9399    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:50:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to comment on your proposed ORV plan for Cape Hatteras. I believe that this plan is unfairly and unwisely prejudiced in favor of ORV use, and that a new plan should be drafted that is more focused on the ecology of the area and the enjoyment of ALL visitors. Thank you for considering my comments.  
Sincerely, Jesse Moss

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9400    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:50:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please leave the beaches and beach lands wild. People are only one part of what uses these lands for life support. ORV are not really necessary for life. Their use actually destroys life support for many life forms and spoils the serenity of the natural world for the rest of us. They are really just toys which, although can be "fun" for those who use them, have potentially devastating effects on everything they pass through. It is my feeling that we, as a people, ought to give serious consideration to letting go of this particular form of "recreation." The time has come. Please keep them off public lands as a beginning.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9401    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ochmanek, E. J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:50:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Send Your Comments Today!  
DEADLINE TUESDAY!!  
(The link above will take you to the National Park Service's Planning, Environment, and Public Comment Site)  
Dear E.,  
URGENT: 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 advocates--like you--fail to take action, Cape Hatteras National Seashore will be dominated by ORV use for the next 20 years!  
NPCA seeks an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.  
Take Action Now: Submit your comments to the NPS by midnight (Mountain Time), Tuesday, May 11, and urge them 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.  
Here's how to submit your comments to the Park Service:  
1) To comment, please click here. This link will take you to the National Park Service's Planning, Environment, and Public Comment Site. The page you will see displayed is the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS comment page.  
2) After filling in your personal information, simply cut and paste the sample letter below into the NPS comment form; we highly encourage you to add your own comments as well.  
3) After completing the comment form, make sure to click the "Submit" button found at the bottom of the page.  
\*\*\*\*\* Sample Letter  
Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9402    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:51:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I vacation very little, but when I do it is at Hatteras, a place where I can count on quiet, wild beaches. Please do not turn these beaches into a place where the pollution from trucks or other vehicles ruins the coast. The noise, the oil, the tracks and the disturbance of birds, turtles and other wildlife will change the experience and leave me wondering if Hatteras will be just another VA Beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9403    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** euston, stanley  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello -- My wife and I traveled across the country to see the National Seashore. That was several years ago. It was a fine experience---except for ORVs using the beach, invading the sounds and sights of the ocean and strand.  
 As far as I'm concerned, ORVs should not be allowed on the beach, period. I do not understand why an off road motorized use in an NPS unit should be allowed to diminish the experience of those of us who enjoy walking, nature watching, wave watching, photography. These uses do not harm the ecosystem or interfere with the enjoyment of the Seashore by others. We have enough vehicles in parks on paved roads.  
 My principal point is that the effects of ORV pollution, particularly carbon pollution, should be a major factor in decision-making. I understand that in fact NPS is developing plans and strategies to respond to global warming. This is a new issue that previous ORV plans have not considered.  
 Stan Euston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9404    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:52:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
 Regards, Deoyani.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9405    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Haresign, Andrea L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:52:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The proposed Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore will disproportionately dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors. Please adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting that which makes Cape Hatteras so special -- abundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9406    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. As people across the country have seen with the impacts of the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, our coastal areas face numerous and sometimes unpredictable threats, and I hope the Park Service reaches a decision regarding ORVs at Cape Hatteras that will ensure the preservation of our natural heritage. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9407    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** GRIMES, HENRY  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:52:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9408    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:52:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a long-time visitor to the Park and I and my family are OPPOSED to the proposal to open the Park to off-road vehicles. I firmly believe this action would have a detrimental impact on the pristine quality of the Park and add unwanted noise, air and water pollution. I also believe that vehicles will detrimentally impact the quality of life and breeding grounds of wildlife. I urge you NOT to open the Park to vehicles as currently proposed.

**Correspondence ID:** 9409    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lacey, Sharon L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:53:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There are areas of land set aside that are to be used by the american people. The use of this land is laid out in the land grant. Here is my issue, the rules set up at the time of the grant are endlessly, relentlessly worked on being eroded. What I really do not understand is why people are forever trying to make inroads into these areas...it reminds me of children coming up with 8 things they need to do instead of going to bed at the designated time. Why are we spending tax dollars to revisit this issue over and over. You know, when I was growing up when my dad said no...that was it. He didn't have to fight over and over and over again with the same subject. The US has over 80% of it lands barren, what is it in human nature to always have what we are not suppose to have. Please let them put on their big boy/girl panties and deal with the law. I work hard for my money, and am tired of it being wasted trying to protect the the small protections we have for our environment. The land grant perimeters are set for a reason...not set "until someone else wanted to change it bad enough." Webster defines perimeter as :the line or relatively narrow space that marks the outer limit of something." The national motto seems to have skewed to be "privatize the profits/benefits and socialize the cost/harm." Why, that is it why.

**Correspondence ID:** 9410    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:54:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9411    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** English, William  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:54:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I, my family, my relatives and my friends have all been in love with the national parks all our lives. One of the most important characteristics of the parks is quiet, the feeling of getting away from it all, communing with nature without interference from man-made noise and objects. To lie on a beach listening to the waves and be interrupted by the whine and snarl of dune buggies churning up the sand violates everything the parks should stand for.

**Correspondence ID:** 9412    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:55:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9413    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:55:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9414    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,

**Correspondence ID:** 9415    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:56:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have so little left; we need to conserve it.

**Correspondence ID:** 9416    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Perry, Sharen  
**Received:** May,07,2010 16:56:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9417    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 16:56:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel strongly that perserving the beach areas is most important. I myself may never get to visit that park but if I did I would like to see it in all it's pristine splendor. If orvs are allowed in I fear for the beach itself, the wildlife and the peace and quiet. Please carefully consider these things before you make any decisions. Thank you. Laura Herrera

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9418    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** wells, michael a  
**Received:** May.07,2010 16:57:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello NPS, I really cannot believe all the time and engery wasted on this idea. In my stark opinion, NO Off Road Vehicles should be on the property now or in the future. I'm not talking about reduced numbers, I mean zero vehicles! What are thinking here? Thanks for listening, Michael Wells

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9419    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely, Carolyn Bishop

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9420    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a supporter of America's national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors, which I really don't think is fair. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the 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, in addition to the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I am extremely grateful 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.

Sincerely,  
LeeAnn Bennett

**Correspondence ID:** 9421    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Vragel, James D

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:57:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I object to any proposal to allow off road vehicles on Cape Hatteras. The noise, pollution, and abuse of the privilege that I'm sure will take place will be a disaster for shore birds, visitors, and the ecosystem of the cape. Please do not pursue this any further.

**Correspondence ID:** 9422    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 16:58:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9423    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

I feel that that the most important stewardship issue is to preserve the ecosystem intact for future generations. That means protecting the wildlife. My own sense is that recreation can take a back seat to this priority. Americans have many other opportunities to recreate themselves. The animals and plants need us to give them a voice. That is why I am writing this letter. In their behalf.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

**Correspondence ID:** 9424    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

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

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

I have myself enjoyed the beach at Ocracoke but except for crowded designated swimming areas, walking or sitting on the uncrowded seashore is dangerous in the face of off road vehicles driven by questionably safe drivers. This does not even take into account the destruction of the pristine views and quiet that the outer banks is treasured for.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9425    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gesell, Judith A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 17:00:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Protect Cape Hatteras form off wheel vehicles!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9426    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 17:01:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The whole idea of going to the seashore is to get out of your car. I'm sick of not being allowed to get away from noisy gas propelled vehicles anywhere. Whether it's Yellowstone or jetskis, some jerk has to put their engine where there should be peace, quiet and nature.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9427    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Don't people have enough places to drive gas guzzling vehicles around, using up foreign oil & spewing carbon monoxide, without allowing them to do so in our National Parks & Beaches? ORV do not have a place in Cape Hatteras. The intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use.  
The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant.  
I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points:  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for 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 very much.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9428    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 17:01:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't sacrifice the beautiful and delicate ecosystems and wildlife in the outer banks. It would be a tragedy if these things were taken away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9429    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Megay, Gina A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a frequent visitor to American beach resorts, avid birder, and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate 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. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. It also fails to take into consideration that many visitors to beaches go there for the quiet and solitude. I personally don't want to see, or hear, the whine of off road vehicles when I am walking on a beautiful stretch of beach or staring into the ocean. Therefore, of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."



0011426

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Gina A Megay

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9430    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:02:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles detract from the quiet beauty of this destination and can disrupt the lives, not to mention taking the lives, of the area wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9431    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Trivisonno, Susan  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:02:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a lifelong supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.  
The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9432    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Willoughby, Emily A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. (I used to live in North Carolina and remember what it was like.) This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I know you will receive many letters very similar to this one. We send them because we believe, and we send the mostly prewritten-ones because we want to make sure that the correct information gets presented time and again, so attention will be paid attention to it. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9433    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:02:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D,

if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Cecilia Young

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9434	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Kyle, Edgar M					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:03:01					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Unlimited off-road vehicles (ORV) on beaches destroys the beaches for quieter pursuits and many forms of wildlife. I strongly encourage you not to allow ORV use on more than a very limited amount of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We are avid campers on Ocracoke Island and enjoy the entire Cape Hatteras area.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9435	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:03:02					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9436	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:04:25					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The National Park Service wants to disproportionately dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors -- there goes a beautiful and peaceful vacation spot! If this happens, I will never go there again! National Parks Conservation Association seeks an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds. Do the right thing!					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9437	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:04:38					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We do not need car pollution to directly ruin our beaches! Keep them on the road where they belong!					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9438	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Pries, Catherine L					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:04:52					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."					

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9439	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. In sum, please adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting that which makes Cape Hatteras so special--abundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore. ***** Thank you 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, Francine L. Dolins, Ph.D.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9440	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Craig, Julianne						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:05:10						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep off road vehicles off Cape Hatteras.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9441	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:06:44						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There is no reason to allow off road vehicles on these pristine beaches. The noise will be disruptive and if you don't want to hear the water, why go to the beach? It would have undetermined effects on wildlife as well. Leave the dunes for off road vehicles and leave the beaches for walking.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9442	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, roy						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:07:03						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	STOP ALL motorized off road "recreation" in national parks. Including Cape Hatteras.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9443	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Sears, Julie C						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:07:42						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	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.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9444	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Craig, Edward P						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:08:20						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Because I like the quiet of a beach with only the white noise of wind and surf punctuated with occasional bird calls I intensely resent the rumble of internal combustion and I am downright irked when they are insufficiently muffled. One of my favorite memories involves losing a box kite over Cape Hatteras on liberty in 1975.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9445	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Sells, Greg						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:08:21						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9446    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:08:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Even though I'm not a resident of North Carolina, I feel that as an American and resident of a state that borders N.C., I have a duty to give my opinion in the matter of off-road vehicles at Cape Hatteras National Park. This pristine beach needs to be left to wildlife and humans - not vehicles that will ruin our beaches and destroy our wildlife habitats. Most of these vehicles have no regard for life in these areas, other than their own and their own happiness. Our National Parks are reserves for us to cherish and protect, not give over to others to ruin.

**Correspondence ID:** 9447    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:09:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9448    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Patch, Bradford  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Have you seen what ORVs do to the land? They tear it up, wear the land down, make a mess and have no volume control. Very few of them even require mufflers. On firm land they are a nuisance. On beaches and marshland, they will ruin the Park for all. Please limit the use of these vehicles to firm land and not at all on the beaches, wetlands and marshlands of Cape Hatteras National Park.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best

examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9449    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Gaguine, John  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:09:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras is a magical place. Please do not abandon it to OTVs. Please give priority to wildlife and foot traffic. Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9450    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:10:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please dont let off road vehicles Ruin Cape Hatteras. We as a Species are destroying the Planet that God has givin to use to Care for Friend

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9451    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Fisher, Harold H  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:10:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9452    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 We submit these comments as members of the National Parks Conservation Association and strong supporters of all of America's national parks. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. As we discovered on a month-long cross-country trip last September, the Seashore is a wonderful resource on the Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people because of its awesome, undeveloped sandy beaches, its salt marshes, and the wonderful maritime woods.  
 We were somewhat aghast to find that all of the alternatives presented in the Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS (the DEIS) appear to be unbalanced in favor of off-road vehicle use, and fail to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make Cape Hatteras National Seashore nationally significant. Let us be clear here: we have nothing against off-road vehicles; we ourselves own a Polaris Sportsman 500 outfitted with a passenger seat, and have enjoyed wonderful off-road adventures with friends who also own what we Oregonians call "ATVs" or "quads." But there are places appropriate for their use, and there are other places that should not be over-run with ORVs. Cape Hatteras National Seashore is one of the latter places. Try as we might, even the most environmentally conscious ORV rider cannot help but leave evidence of his or her passage through an area -- and that is without even considering the unavoidable noise (sound pollution, if you will) of the engines.  
 Of the six alternative plans outlined in the DEIS, we can support only Alternative D, identified as "environmentally preferred" -- and only IF it is modified to include and recognize the following:  
 1) The National Park Service (NPS) must not ignore its responsibilities under both the Organic Act and the legislation authorizing the National Seashore: to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations, and protecting its wildlife, simply must take precedence over a single form of recreation (that is, off-road vehicles). Furthermore, ANY recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason: "Except for 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 then, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not designate a new place for ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. We trust you will give them your most serious and thoughtful consideration. We do appreciate the hard work and dedication it takes from staff at NPS to preserve the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations, and we hope to see an improved final ORV management plan for the beautiful Cape Hatteras National Seashore, which is on our list of "must re-visit" locales.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9453    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:11:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

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

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

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

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

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

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9454	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:11:05						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: <b>Provide Equal Access for All Visitors:</b> Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. <b>Put Natural Resources First:</b> Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. <b>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery:</b> A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9455	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:11:11						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: <b>Provide Equal Access for All Visitors:</b> Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. <b>Put Natural Resources First:</b> Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. <b>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery:</b> A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9456	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:11:11						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: <b>Provide Equal Access for All Visitors:</b> Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.						

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9457    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:11:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9458    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:11:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9459    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:11:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best

examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sincerely, Kimberly Hurschik

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9460	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:11:16						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9461	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:11:16						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9462	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:11:17						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9463	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:11:17						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which</p>						



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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9464    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:11:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9465    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:11:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9466    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:11:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9467    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:11:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9468    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:11:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9469    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:11:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9470	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:11:28						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9471	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:11:28						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9472	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:11:34						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9473	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:12:25						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement</p>						

privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9474    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Pendleton, Gary M  
**Received:** May.07.2010 17:12:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please reconsider this atrocious idea, allowing motor vehicles into this pristine area is absolutely a terrible idea.

**Correspondence ID:** 9475    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 17:13:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9476    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 17:13:36  
**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 vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9477    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07.2010 17:13:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that

make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9478    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Even though I now reside in California, I visit this beautiful area every year and it is a grave mistake to allow ORV use to damage this magnificent beach area.

Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,

Patricia Nickles El Segundo, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9479    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 17:14:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9480    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 17:14:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

me.

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9481    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 17:14:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9482    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Eads, Claudia

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Claudia Eads, MD

**Correspondence ID:** 9483    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Finder-Stone, RN, MS, Patricia A

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the League of Conservation Voters, Sierra Club, and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a

nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches.

All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant.

Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9484    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Henderson, Doris  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:16:17  
**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:** 9485    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Taylor, James B  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
James Taylor

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9486    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** tomlinson, paul  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:17:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Do we really need to have ORVs' running up and down the beach driving off the wildlife and annoying the people walking with the ORV noise and exhaust fumes?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9487    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bullock, George V  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

**Correspondence ID:** 9488    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a long standing supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area has historically been cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally and environmentally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points:

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. I do not believe that is possible, ORV use will inevitably harm wilderness and wildlife. Further, once ORV use is permitted, it's limitations will be ignored and abused.

Accordingly, I am of the opinion that ORV use should be permanently banned from Cape Hatteras.

- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan, but preferably a permanent ban on such vehicles.

\*\*\*\*\* 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,  
J. Alexander

**Correspondence ID:** 9489    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

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

**Received:** May.07.2010 17:18:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9490    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

I grew up in north central New Jersey and visited Cape Hatteras many times with my parents and in high school years with several friends. I vividly remember the natural beauty of the area and feel that it should remain as natural as possible for all future generations.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,

Craig S. Swenson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9491    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cone, Nelson  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:20:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** At a time when we are trying to reduce combustion engine emissions and we are facing a oil supply shortage, this is no time to expand access and usage of gasoline driven vehicles to our precious environment. Keep the ORVs off our beaches. They are also dangerous to people on foot enjoying the natural environment and don't want it polluted with noise and fumes. Use "Common Sense" and keep ORVs off the beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9492    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** gerhard, delia  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:20:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I urge everyone involved in this process to think soberly about the inevitable loss of Cape Hatteras shoreline, if recreational vehicles are allowed use of this irreplaceable piece of our national coastline. I went each summer to Cape Hatteras as a child and it was these wild and pristine shores that kept us returning. The shore was full of life but not a vehicle to be seen anywhere, in fact, the possibility would have been bewildering. Why must we insist on making every place, a kind of highway, don't we have enough of those? Sincerely, Delia Gerhard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9493    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McFaye, Adrienne  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:20:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** DON'T LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9494    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** scholz, ernest J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:21:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** no offside vehicles

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9495    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Barnbaum, Bruce B  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:21:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** ORV usage is one of the most intense, destructive type of uses imaginable, utterly devastating to wildlife and to all people seeking a quiet, relaxing period to get away from the many frenetic aspects of daily life. It should not be permitted under any circumstances in any National Park, Seashore, or Recreational Area, as well as any designated Wilderness area. Cape Hattras deserves maximum protection. This should be self-evident. If it is not, the US is failing in its claimed efforts to protect the land for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9496    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:21:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sometimes you just have to say "NO", everyone can not experience everything. I like to wander the quiet beach with the only noise to be heard is that of the sea gulls flying overhead.  
ORVs are noisy, destroy the land they travel over and take away so much more than they give.  
Let the ORVs travel over trails already established for that reason. Beaten down dirt trails hopefully far away from the ears of other humans.  
Thanks for listening.  
Barb Wells

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9497    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:22:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9498    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sato, Nancy E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:23:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No off-road vehicles should ever be allowed on National Seashore or National park land. They add to noise, air and environmental pollution and degradation and do not benefit anyone but the selfish desires of the few people who use them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9499    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:23:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect Cape Hatteras from people using ORV's on the beaches or anywhere near the beaches. You are the only ones who can stop this from happening. Please don't let them. We are ruining this planet little by little. Every negative impact destroys precious life and imparts pollution where it doesn't belong. Why make the beaches sickened with pollution and noise. Why ruin it for any animal or sea life that live there. Why ruin it for people to enjoy a quiete time there to relax and enjoy what nature has to offer us. Let the people ride the ORV's in a less fragile place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9500    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,  
Robin A. Futrell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9501    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Haaning, Quentin C  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:25:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** People drive out onto the beach, maybe just once in a while to look around, or perhaps regularly to find their favorite parking spot for surf fishing. If this is projected for ten or twenty years, very few will even bother, it will be so casually crowded. In a decade or two after that, it will be a meaningless act because of the loss of any remnant of natural beauty. If, on the other hand, parking is provided 1/4 mile away, and our descendants walk out to the beach and see pleasant shores, beaches as they were in "days of yore", they will be grateful and delighted that some of the past has been preserved. They will NOT have suffered any deprivation for having been denied casual, harmful motor access. I plead with you to use your influence and understanding to help preserve our natural places and beauty. In decades or even centuries to come, people will be rewarded and grateful. Quentin Haning Raleigh

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9502    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Kathleen Klinkenberg

---

Correspondence ID: 9503    Project: 10641    Document: 32596    Private: Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely, Nancy Johnson

---

Correspondence ID: 9504    Project: 10641    Document: 32596    Private: Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 17:28:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Too many of our hours aboard this planet involve hearing noises of machinery. Humanity needs peace and quiet. Keep the beach pristine and quiet. Ban off-road vehicles.

---

Correspondence ID: 9505    Project: 10641    Document: 32596    Private: Y

Name: private

Received: May.07.2010 17:28:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Where I Live, I've been an outdoors person my entire Life - fished /hunted ever since childhood, I'll be 48 years old this summer and have spent a great deal of those years in forests and on lakes and streams every chance I got. When ATV's ( 4-wheelers ) entered the scene, it was like night and day to the ecosystem here to national and state forests, lake shorelines etc. I don't Live near Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I Live in the state with most shoreline in the USA. ( Minnesota ) and I can speak from first hand experience on what ATV's have done contributing to Eurasian Milfoil expansion, as well as the devastation it's caused to pheasant populations. ATV "Enthusiasts" are NOT people who respect natural habitat areas, and Wild Life in general, period. The retailers host "Rallies" - they sponsor them - to continue ruining natural habitats. The mind-set is completely the opposite of outdoor people. ATV's offer them the same feelings that are obtained on a carnival ride. They destroy and trample all over where waterfowl lay their eggs each spring, here in MN, in the southern half of the state there was finally an uproar and they've outlawed them from spring months onto 3/4ths the way through summer our ecosystems have nature's checks and balances when it comes to insects, birds that thrive on them, etc etc etc - They wiped out grouse populations here within 3 years of becoming "popular" - grouse feast on clover and use gravel to help them digest their food, Rabbit and Grouse are in them same natural cycles they are food for hawks, foxes, etc- Another "Fine thing" ATV riders do - I can't count the times I've walked down a logging road / fire break road I've hunted decades - and seeing these tracks everywhere- and coming to where they 'camped out' - and seeing blobs of oil - they change their oil out there and yes just leave it, AND - here in MN - Lakes stream everywhere all connected- yes it goes right into our yes, scared waters, rivers, Lakes, streams - if you let these people run rampant through Cape Hatteras National Seashore- it will turly be a sad event. Please don't let them. Tell them what they need to hear - that being "If they really enjoy the butterflies in their tummies they get zipping around in circles - they should try a county fair or amusement park someplace - our National and State Forests are OUR NATIONAL AND STATE FORESTS FOR A

**Correspondence ID:** 9506 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Chadran, Achmad M  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:28:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9507 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bonilla-Jones, Carmen E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:28:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am sick unto death of the Forest Service, the BLM, the EPA, the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Services finding excuses for killing off the Wildlife of this nation and destroying our Parks and misuse of our public lands. The National Parks and public lands belong to the American people. They have agreed and allowed their tax dollars to be used in the maintenance and purchase of these lands so that not only they but also future generations will have a place to relax and remember the great open places of our Country. I cannot understand why the National Park Services, the BLM, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, the Forest Services or the EPA insist on destroying the National Parks and public lands of the United States of America, which they have been charged with protecting.  
 Why must All Terrain Vehicles and/or snowmobiles be discussed and brought up every year? The National Parks are considered a place to relax and get away from the noise, pollution and stress of everyday life. A place to walk and contemplate life's miracles as well as a place to see all the natural beauty and wildlife placed on this planet by our Creator. They are not a place to hear the whine of motors or smell the pollution and exhaust of any recreational vehicles including snowmobiles. It is time that the humans of this world start taking care of all the living animals and plants on the planet. If we do not start reversing the trend to annihilate every living creature other than ourselves we risk destroying the planet and the existence of all living creatures including ourselves. Enough is enough! Put all the riders in jail the minute they and their illegal vehicles cross onto any national park or roadless designated area.

**Correspondence ID:** 9508 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Yang, Jo-Shing  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:28:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a concerned citizen, a registered voter, and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9509 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:29:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As the statement " a threat to liberty anywhere is a threat to liberty everywhere" rings true it seems applicable in that a "threat to beaches anywhere is a threat to beaches everywhere!" I am not interested in having to listen to dirtbikes, dunebuggies and ATV's when I am at the beach...neither does anybody else! So relegate off-road vehicles to desert areas that nobody goes to and everybody wins. I'm writing to keep off-road vehicles off Cape Hatteras so I never have to worry about keeping them off of Big or Little Corona!

**Correspondence ID:** 9510 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:29:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am stunned to learn that ORV might be allowed virtually unlimited access to the pristine and SILENT seashores of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We MUST preserve areas where the sounds of Nature prevail and where endangered and valuable wildlife can life undisturbed. Please know that I am adamantly opposed to any such plan.  
 Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 9511    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Yang, Tony C.  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:29:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a concerned citizen, a registered voter, and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9512    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** allen, priscilla  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:30:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern. I feel strongly about this and I and use support our parks.  
 Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9513    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Yang, Yu-Mei  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:30:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a concerned citizen, a registered voter, and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9514    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:30:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Dale N. Le Fevre

**Correspondence ID:** 9515    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** walker, craig  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:31:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9516    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sorrells, Phillip  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:31:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep off-road vehicles OFF of Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches!

**Correspondence ID:** 9517    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Yang, Richard  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:31:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a registered voter, a concerned citizen, and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9518    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Murray, Carol  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:31:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Beaches are for people and wildlife - not off-road-vehicles. Let's keep our beaches pristine and natural for all to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9519    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Marsh, Sherry  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:32:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please save the environment by banning off-road vehicles from damaging the coast of Cape Hatteras. This should be designated a conservation area. Sherry Marsh

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9520    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:32:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I spent many weeks visting the area as my husband was a Tar Heel. The beaches are fragile and subject to numerous nasty storms, winds and hurricanes. Man should do everything possible to refrain from participating in any activity that would cause man-made damages. The area should also be cared for as it is the only barrier that protects the coast.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9521    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Majors, Judith M  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:35:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
As a family we camp and vacation every few years at Hatteras. We love coming there for the natural environment and want to continue enjoying it unimpaired.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Judith M Majors

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9522    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:35:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9523    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Krueger, Bradley  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:36:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Why do so many people yearning to experience the grandeur of something like the dunes and ocean surf have to secede our rights to this to a few selfish few with roaring machines that leave nothing but noise, pollution and destruction in their wake?  
How is a turtle or a bird supposed to find that safe haven for their young if these thoughtless few can roll over them at will?  
We have caused enough destruction. stop it now.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9524    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:36:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9525    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lanier, Belle  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:36:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Okay, people, listen up: For years and years, fishers and others who simply appreciate the natural beauty of Hatteras Island managed to enjoy it WITHOUT SUVs, ORVs and whatever. And, looking at most visitors to the Island, it's apparent a little walking while hauling gear would do them no harm. Vehicles wear out, people die, but Hatteras Island will protect the wonder of nature and its creatures for more centuries - if destructive humankind stays out of its way. Why was your agency created? Do your job! And bless you for doing so.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9526    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Dumont, Lynette  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:37:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Beaches are NOT the place for ORVs. Not ever!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9527    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:38:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Having lived in Chatham, Mass on the cape as a family home, I hate to see what is happening to the Gulf happen to our beautiful sandbar or Boston Harbor, not to mention New York Harbor and Long Island!!! Please stop drilling now.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9528    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:38:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.



**Correspondence ID:** 9529    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely, Joshua Heffron

**Correspondence ID:** 9530    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:39:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There continues to be an assault on our Park system by individuals who are in my opinion selfish and unwilling to accept "no" for an answer about anything that they feel infringes on THEIR rights. Whether on the beaches of Cape Hatteras or in the wilds of Yellowstone, I feel there is no place for these noisy, polluting machines. The purpose of the Park system is to preserve nature--animals, flora, and their habitat--not just for OUR enjoyment, but for THEIR survival and peaceful existence. As the human population soars skyward, there is a massive encroachment all over the world on existing species. Let's don't add the Park system to this assault. Please block the attempts to allow off-road vehicles onto the beaches of Cape Hatteras. And while you're at it, please get rid of those awful snowboarding and all-terrain vehicles in other parks. I worked at the Old Faithful Lodge in Yellowstone for two summers, and it was a formative experience of my life. It appalls me how current day tourists feel that they have the right to utilize such beautiful and sacred settings for some wild and crazy entertainment. Where is their awe, their respect for Nature's (or God's?) creation? Why do they need such artificial contrivances in order to enjoy the world? Please vote NO to off-road vehicles on the beaches of Hatteras and elsewhere.

**Correspondence ID:** 9531    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:40:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9532    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:40:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason. "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9533	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:40:32					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras should be off limits to all vehicles. This is a treasure fr all to enjoy. We have enough roads as is. Keep pristine shores pristine!					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9534	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:40:37					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Are you kidding me? This is supposed to be a wilderness area - why are you even considering allowing these noisy, intrusive, damaging vehicles in this beautiful area? Do your job and just say no. It's easy. Say it with me, "NO!" See, it's real easy when you actually do your job and stop catering to the few.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9535	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Growing up in Williamsburg, VA, my family and I have been visiting the Outer Banks every summer since my birth - for 32 years now. There have been countless changes to the area in that time, and most notably, the encroachment of human activities on the very lands that bring tourists every year. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9536	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:41:05					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9537	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 17:41:05					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9538    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:41:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9539    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:41:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9540    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:41:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9541    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:41:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9542    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:41:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9543    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:41:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9544    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 17:41:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9545    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 17:41:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9546    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 17:41:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9547    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 17:41:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9548    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07,2010 17:41:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9549    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07,2010 17:41:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9550    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07,2010 17:41:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9551    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:41:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9552    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:41:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sample Letter  
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:** 9553    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:41:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 9554    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:41:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9555    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:41:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9556    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment and hope that you will read my concerns regarding the Cape Hatteras management plan for ORV use. I am sending you the below statements to show my support for prohibiting ORV use on a larger area of Cape Hatteras National Seashore park lands than just the proposed 16 miles. ORV-users will argue that parks are set aside for recreation; however, as a frequent beach visitor myself, and a resident taxpayer of North Carolina, my family's and my enjoyment of the beach as a pedestrian is highly diminished by ORVs due to the noise, intrusion, and general disregard for others that has been displayed in the past by these same ORVs, not to mention the disruption to NC wildlife, which I value highly as well. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for reading and considering my concerns. I love North Carolina, and I only want to preserve its beauty.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9557    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:41:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form



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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9558    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:43:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The way to enjoy the seashore is to be able to walk in peace, listen to the sounds of the ocean and the shorebirds. We who live near the ocean work hard to preserve the integrity of our coastline for human enjoyment and for the preservation of wildlife breeding here. There are ordinances to prevent destruction of dunes and marshes and other wetland areas. Do not allow motorized vehicles which can be so destructive to be permitted to use these areas for recreation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9559    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Grenard, Mark Hayduke  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:44:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do not want ORVs along the Cape beach area. It is pristine, quiet that should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9560    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:44:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9561    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:44:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9562    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:44:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
PLEASE PROTECT OUR WILDLIFE AND MAINTAIN A NATIONAL SEASHORE FOR THE BENEFIT OF ALL. ORV's SHOULD BE KEPT AT A MINIMUM NUMBER OF DAYS AND AREAS> SEA TURTLES AND THEIR NESTING PLACES MUST BE PROTECTED AS WELL AS THE Piping PLOVER!  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9563    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:44:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9564    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:44:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

0011460

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9565    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:44:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9566    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:44:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9567    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:44:30  
**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.  
Please consider restricting the use of ORVs at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The use of ORVs in sensitive wildlife habitat areas and nesting grounds for threatened and endangered species is untenable.  
Public recreation is a privilege, not a right. Efforts have been made to give ORV enthusiasts, Cyclists, Climbers and other outdoorsman dedicated areas for their recreation.  
The Cape Hatteras National Seashore should be preserved for future generations of both American citizens and the wildlife we depend on for our connection with nature.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9568    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:44:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 \*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 \* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 \* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9569    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Weidman, Janet  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:45:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect Cape Hatteras shoreline from ORV use. Sea turtles and nesting shorebirds are more important than joy rides on ORVs. Thank you for considering my views.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9570    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Stoltenberg, John and Martha  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:45:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are opposed to all Off Road Vehicles (ORVs) in the Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9571    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:45:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9572    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Greuel, Bridget  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:45:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of

0011462

the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Off-road vehicles do nothing but destroy our National Parks for the benefit of a very few people. Currently, there are plenty of off-road vehicle designated areas for them... please do not ruin FOREVER such a beautiful place as Cape Hatteras!!!  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9573    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:45:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicles, they should ban all off-road vehicles from ruining the natural beauty, there's other places for them to go.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9574    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kaiser, Robert  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:46:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9575    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:46:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9576    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:47:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We need to protect the few clean places left.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9577    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Serrato, Luanne M  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:47:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore should be free of off-road vehicle traffic. It is hard to enjoy a day at the beach when noisy, polluting off-road vehicles are present. They are a danger to visitors and wild life and should not be allowed.  
Thank you for reading and considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9578    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** O'Bryant, Ronda R  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am interested in the welfare of both man and animal and flora! It is my contention that God created this world for us to be good stewards of and to not allow the guilty and the criminals to go unpunished and that includes inhumane acts against the helpless creatures on this beautiful planet!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9579    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** macdonald, angus m  
**Received:** May.07.2010 17:50:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9580    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 17:50:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please prevent the destruction of the national treasure that is Cape Hatteras by off road vehicles. I have seen the extensive damage these vehicles can cause to the land and beaches. But there is also the consideration of destructio of the peace. Many people go to the beach to immerse themselves in nature and experience the wonders of the convergence of land and sea. This can be a spiritual experience which is not possible with ORVs buzzing by. Please do not let this happen!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9581    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 17:50:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I grew up in North Carolina and was lucky enough to visit and camp out on Cape Hatteras. My family and I still go there almost annually and it is a TREASURE to have an unspoiled beach, especially a wild one with dunes and native "critters" and birds still abounding. Do not allow off-road vehicles to spoil this precious space, please.  
Sincerely, Alice Caldwell Steele  
P.S. I volunteer in the National Park System as president of a non-profit in partnership with the NPS. My non-profit is Miwok Stables Center. Please listen to my plea!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9582    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Our lawmakers cannot continue to ignore the responsibilities under the Organic and the National Seashore's. Our environment and wildlife is currently undergoing horrible assaults from oil spills and lack of environmentally concious decisions. This is our land, not the lawmakers. We the people demand conservation of our natural resources and wildlife. To permit ORVs on this pristine land would be a catastrophe.  
Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

0011464

\*\*\*\*\* 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,  
Chris Watson Program Manager, Southeast Region

**Correspondence ID:** 9583    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:51:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9584    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:51:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I hope that Cape Hatteras will be left in its pristine state and the best way to do this is to modify Alternate D in the statement as a protective alternative.

**Correspondence ID:** 9585    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Yarnell, Susan L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
Susan L Yarnell

**Correspondence ID:** 9586    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Our lawmakers cannot continue to ignore the responsibilities under the Organic and the National Seashore's. Our environment and wildlife is currently undergoing horrible assaults from oil spills and lack of environmentally concious decisions. This is our land, not the lawmakers. We the people demand conservation of our natural resources and wildlife. To permit ORVs on this pristine land would be a catastrophe.

Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,

Chris Watson Program Manager, Southeast Region

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9587    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hillegass, Gene A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** none

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9588    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** schaming, carol b  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:55:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** we need to remember to keep parks; natural, quiet. If we respect wildlife, we would keep these vehicles out. Our last remnants of a beautiful, awe inspiring natural world is all but being lost to human interest. Lets keep our ecosystems holistic. By helping nature, we benefit, by having an oasis to drink from in our hectic, stressful lives.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9589    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:55:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9590    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 17:56:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** ear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association, a surfer and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9591    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private



**Received:** May,07,2010 17:56:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. sincerely, Claire Curran

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9592    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

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 protect the wilderness and fauna that make this area significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) Conserving Cape Hatteras and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus the intent of Congress was to protect the experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is essential that NPS protect the pedestrian experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9593    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 17:57:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No - NO - NO, NO, NO!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9594    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** DiMento, Louis

**Received:** May,07,2010 17:58:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please protect the wildlife of Cape Hatteras as well as visitors' experiences of nature by limiting the use of Off Road Vehicles in your management plan so that they will not harm the wilderness.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9595    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 17:58:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best

examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9596    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cunnally, John J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,  
 Bud Cunnally Electronics Chief Petty Officer Submarines Retired

**Correspondence ID:** 9597    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a registered Environmental Professional, a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource.

All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement favor ORV use - something that should NOT be allowed in an area designated as a national park. This approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to PROTECT the habitat first, and to allow recreational use that does not adversely impact the primitive wilderness. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the plants and animals that call this area home, as well as protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras. THIS MEAN PROHIBITING ORV USE!
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerley,  
 Sandra Mann

**Correspondence ID:** 9598    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:00:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It seems the NPS has put their own objectives above the good of the park, the wildlife, the visitors and the people that live there on the Outer Banks.

Why is 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 ORBS.

Why is not more of your plan based on science? Best available science is a buzz word and has nothing to do with the actual use of scientific findings. Your use of statistics is laughable. Your main use of science and statistics is anecdotal. 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 systematically 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:** 9599    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** wright, dian  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Save Cape Hatteras!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9600    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely, Wendy Walters

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9601    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:01:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 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:** 9602    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:02:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Stop all off road vehicles on the beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9603    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9604    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:04:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** please leave these parks untouched by these vehicles!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9605    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 18:04:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not allow any more off road vehicles on Cape Hatteras. I'm not sure I understand why any vehicles other than National Park Service need to drive on beaches at all. I don't get it. I will be vacationing in the Outer Banks in June, I'm very much looking forward to seeing it for the first time. We are staying in the Cape Hatteras area. Doesn't the wild life have enough to contend with? As I see so many signs in summer about highway workers - Give em a brake - How bout lets give the wildlife a break. Give them a chance to live - would you like to be driven over by an SUV?  
Sincerely,  
Lynne Van Treeck

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9606    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 18:05:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** During wildlife nesting season all vehicles should not be allowed on the beach to give the wildlife in the area a quiet, peaceful and safe environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9607    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Goodin, Ben

**Received:** May,07,2010 18:05:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** DON'T LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE! There are already far too many parks and forests that allow these noisy, environmentally horrible things. Make the fat slob walk and loose some weight and help decrease our health care costs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9608    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 18:05:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Stop the pollution and poison so that all species can survive without mutations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9609    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** karlson, fred

**Received:** May,07,2010 18:05:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep off road vehicles off beach property at Cape Hatteras and thereby help to preserve local wildlife. Thanks for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9610    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Sechrist, Shelley

**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. At a time in our history when our country is overpopulated, overdeveloped and over mechanized, we need our parks to be places of peace and quiet. So do the wildlife. ORV's should stay on roads where they can do no damage. If people don't want the peace of the park, they can go elsewhere.  
The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9611    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

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

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** You can select the birds over humans but that will only drive down tax revenue and make the Banks just a "birdland". That is what some people want and I understand. BUT why would you want to do such a thing. The Banks should be enjoyed the families and sport enthusiast. It is the gem of NC and people work all year to go there and breath the sea air. Pick people over this bird.....as Darwin clearly demonstrated, evolution is powerful thing. This bird can coexist with people and find a habitat. Thanks for listening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9612    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Farkash, Stephanie

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely, Stephanie Farkash

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9613    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sellen, Betty-Carol  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:07:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Beaches are for walking. Off the road vehicles are noisy, dangerous, hard on the environment including beach creatures, and destroy tranquility sought in nature. Let the boys and their toys seek elsewhere for places to play.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9614    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:09:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9615    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:09:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9616    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** McClain, Barbara A

<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:09:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Pls do not approve the Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I feel it will be hazardous for the beach to allow year-round ORV traffic. This will be at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9617	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Baker-Smith, Gerritt and Elizabeth				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:09:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep off-road vehicles off the Cape Hatteras beaches.... the damage they cause to the ecosystem; and the noise and turmoil they create are simply not needed there. thank you for listening.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9618	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Stone-Meyer, Virginia				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:09:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please give Cape Hatteras better protection from environment degradation. Prevent off road vehicles from further erosion of the beaches and grass dunes.r				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9619	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Grace, Joan M				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>As someone who grew up in New Jersey and has a deep love for the Jersey shore, I am dismayed that you might consider permitting off-road vehicles to intrude into this very special place and urge you to preserve its integrity.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>Sincerely, Joan M. Grace</p>				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9620	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Bechtel, Paul				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:10:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9621	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	private				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the				

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

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

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

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

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

There are too few coastal beach habitats remaining for wildlife species that depend on them that are undisturbed by human activity. Cape Hatteras NS needs to provide those habitats for present and future generations of the American people so they can observe and enjoy those species.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9622    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9623    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9624    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

0011473

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9625    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9626    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9627    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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



**Correspondence ID:** 9628    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 9629    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 9630    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 9631    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9632    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9633    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9634    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9635    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9636    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9637    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:11:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9638    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kriegler, Bertha

**Received:** May,07,2010 18:13:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles are noisy and a hazard for wildlife and a put-off for those who want to enjoy nature.

**Correspondence ID:** 9639    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sams, Donna  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:13:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** DONT LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE

**Correspondence ID:** 9640    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:14:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Please consider the alternate plan - each resource we have we must protect. This area is a national treasure and we must act responsibly. Tourism that sustains and cherishes the local beauty can be very economically rewarding. This has been proven time and time again. Take care of this place. The eyes of your children and their children are upon you.

**Correspondence ID:** 9641    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:14:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 9642    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:14:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 9643    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:14:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9644    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07,2010 18:14:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9645    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07,2010 18:14:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

This is so important in today's world where habitat is being destroyed at an alarming rate.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9646    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07,2010 18:14:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
I would prefer that ORVs be completely and permanently banned from use at CHNS. The NPS should manage the parks to protect the land and wildlife, even if it comes at the expense of visitor access or freedoms.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9647    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:14:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9648    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:14:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9649    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:14:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9650	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	marcus, stuart					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:15:28					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	stop off road vehicles ruining our beaches					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9651	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Taylor, Red					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:15:41					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9652	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Sylvia, Joan E					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:15:52					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9653	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Hartinian, Linda					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:16:10					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Nobody wants another ruined beach don't let this happen.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9654	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Liebeskind, Al					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:16:24					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing this message requesting your attention regarding the policy of "letting" off road vehicles the right to dominate the Cape Hatteras National Seashore! Please reject this plan for environmental, biological and pedestrian reasons.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9655	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:17:06					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I think it is a misuse of a public park which should be protected land to use it for off road vehicles. They disrupt the environment and are dangerous. Since they are popular, a commercial vendor can make a "play area" for people who enjoy this. Please do not allow this activity to be extended to a public park.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9656	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Clark, Patricia					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:17:34					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I think that non endangered birds should not be treated as the Piping Plover. North Carolina Wildlife agencies are clear and correct on this. I think that management buffers should be based on a science based properly peer reviewed method. I think that the rights guaranteed to the people of the villages from the enabling legislation, Superintendent Wirth statements, and 400 years of history, (just a few of these with the NPS)are obvious and valid. The beaches adjoining the villages should not be treated in the same manner as other beaches. Huger corridors and blocked areas are unnecessary and punitive.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9657	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Moore, Wayne					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:18:27					

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Wayne Moore, I am sending this letter to you because of my concerns that you are closing off Cape Point and the beaches to the public and me personally. You are proposing to keep me and others from driving on the beaches and not allowing us to fish these areas as we all have enjoyed for many years. There is a Lady that stood up at one of your meetings, her name is Carol Dillon, and I learned a lot from her that I did not know. When she and her family gave this land, there were promises made, specifically that you would keep the beaches open to the public. It used to be that a man was as good as his word and I hope that still stands. I am a native of North Carolina and a tax payer and I still want to be able to drive the beaches at Cape Point on the Outer Banks and enjoy the area. Being a taxpayer, this park belongs to me as much as it does to all the other people that go there and I would like to see the beaches stay open for access for driving and fishing and to the general public.  
Thank you for listening to my concerns.  
Wayne Moore

**Correspondence ID:** 9658      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Seff, Joshua J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:19:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 9659      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Moss, Robert  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:19:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have visited Cape Hatteras National Seashore several times since my first visit in 1971. Off-road vehicles should be allowed only to the extent required by law. Off-road vehicles are not a legitimate form of recreation. They destroy the air, land, water, (including the wildlife therein,) and the peace. Their users fail to get healthful exercise; instead they breathe unhealthy fumes. They're not about handicapped access; they're about thrills which should be obtained in ORV playgrounds built especially for the purpose (if any place can be found where the neighbors will allow it).

**Correspondence ID:** 9660      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Erickson, Josiah  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:22:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** For many years I owned acreage on Cape Hatteras. The purchaser put the acreage into a wilderness reserve, thus preserving its wildness and its wildlife. I wish that more devotees of Cape Hatteras had the same foresight and sense of obligation to that beautiful land- and sea-scape. What sacrilege to allow overpowered polluting monsters to roar down pristine beaches, destroying the quiet and wreaking havoc with the wildlife. For shame!!

**Correspondence ID:** 9661      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Carter, Judith L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:22:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
I grew up in the 1950s and 60s traveling with my family all over this country, camping in parks from the Smoky Mountains to Yosemite. I have a great love for the remaining quiet, relatively unpopulated areas of the national parks.  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.



**Correspondence ID:** 9662    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Walsh, Thomas J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The National Park Service should not be running off-highway vehicle amusement parks. Off-highway vehicle use is harmful to wildlife and destructive of soils and vegetation. Its noise, dust and the hazard of being hit by a motor vehicle excludes other users from an area. The vehicle operators do not obey the law. Noise limits are often exceeded and operation where prohibited is common. The NPS should not be degrading the environment and depriving other visitors the chance to enjoy a facility by allowing motor vehicles. I am sure there are some who would enjoy riding OHVs up and down the steps of the Lincoln Monument and claim, that being handicapped, it is the only way they can enjoy the place. The NPS should not be accommodating off-highway vehicle use and sightseeing flights in the facilities and areas which it manages.

**Correspondence ID:** 9663    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:23:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Opening the Cape Hatteras National Seashore to off-road vehicle is an appallingly bad idea. There are plenty of non-essential areas available for the ATV crowd which can readily adapt to new or different places for their recreational activities. The same cannot be said of the wildlife that needs this shoreline habitat for their very survival.  
Please DO NOT open the Seashore to ATVs.  
Sincerely,  
Annette L. Stone 2204 Robert Wynn St. El Paso, TX 79936

**Correspondence ID:** 9664    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:23:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Respectfully,  
Colin M. Skeele

**Correspondence ID:** 9665    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Winkel, Marguerite L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:23:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
Surely the ORV crowd can find some already degraded area for their noisy destructive fun. Please save the beaches for people, wildlife and posterity for those who value them and will treat them as the treasures that they are.  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9666    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:24:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

It's time to put a check on the 'motorheads', and give consideration to the majority of visitors to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I for one do not like getting 'buzzed' by the ORVs when I visit the shore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9667      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596      **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 18:24:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9668      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Bass, Brenda M

**Received:** May,07,2010 18:24:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I am writing because of my concerns over the proposed closure of Cape Point and the beaches on the Outer Banks to the general public. People have fished in this area in large numbers and tourists in general visit every year. The loss of the income these people bring to the area just might impose an economic hardship to the businesses in that area.

This land was given as a gift from the Dillon family with the guarantee that the public would always have access. As a taxpaying citizen of North Carolina, I would hope that our government agencies would respect the promises given. It will be a sad comment on our history if they do not.

I hope that future generations are allowed to enjoy this beautiful area freely, just as I have many many times.

Sincerely,  
Brenda Bass

**Correspondence ID:** 9669      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** McKiernan, Cheryl

**Received:** May,07,2010 18:25:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I am concerned about the Park Service's plans and stated preferred alternative to extend the lease and use agreement for the Jackson Hole Airport for two 10-year terms, until 2053, without including additional restrictions to reduce cumulative impacts caused by increasing air traffic in Grand Teton. I would like the park to specifically address the problems that have surrounded the operation of the airport within the park in their final Environmental Impact Statement. Any extended lease agreement should be contingent upon the Jackson Hole Airport not expanding their operations onto any additional park land, and not exceeding set noise criteria in the future. Failure to comply should be directly linked to the continuation of their park lease with the National Park Service. The location of the airport within the park brings with it a tremendous responsibility for the Park Service to make sure that operations at the airport are not given priority over protection of park resources. I am concerned that extending this lease will lead to more noise over the park, particularly over the Murie Center, and the new Laurance S. Rockefeller Preserve. I urge the park to make sure that any new agreement that allows continued airport operations within the park include provisions to markedly decrease allowed levels of noise, and restrict any further airport expansion beyond what has currently been approved. The Park Service must also ensure that the existing runway will never be extended beyond its current length in the future.

**Correspondence ID:** 9670      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596      **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 18:26:29

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Vehicles have no place on fragile beach fronts. Wildlife is endangered especially during breeding and nesting times. Please limit the access of off-road vehicles to Americas shoreline.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9671	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Williams , David C					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:27:10					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We visit this area regularly and feel it is a crime to have the beach filled with this type of vehicle. Nature is under attack all over from mankind and it has to stop. Sea turtles are threatened by these vehicles and their presence Please don't let people drive on these beaches. Please.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9672	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Ognjanovic, Michelle					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:27:17					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Quiet is quiet, not noisy from off-road vehicles. Animals need quiet to nest, feed, mate, etc, and people need quiet, period.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9673	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:27:52					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To allow this kind of nature wrecking loudness into a National Park is an atrocity. Places of contemplative refuge and natural beauty are becmming increasingly rare - do not desecrate them.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9674	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:27:55					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am against allowing ORVs to enter the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Slow moving turtles and other wildlife will be unable to move out of the way of vehicles that are noisy and drivers who care only about making noise and driving erratically. This is their pleasure but not mine and this seashore is not the place for unthinking drivers.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9675	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	clements, patricia					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:29:26					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	ORV's ruin the quiet, peaceful nature of the beach and harm wildlife. Please keep them off the cape.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9676	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>Primitive Wilderness does not include Off Road Vehicles.</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>***** Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!</p> <p>Sincerely, Patricia Shade, MA LPC Newport, Oregon 97365</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9677	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:31:10					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Keep the outer beaches pristine! No lines of ATVs spewing fumes and noise!					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9678	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Cannon, John					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
 John R. Cannon, Ph.D. Conservation Biologist

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9679    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:31:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** DEAR SIRs; THE COMMENT I NEED TO MAKE IS ONLY THIS; THAT THIS AREA IS VERY BUEATIFUL AND TRANQUIL AND NEEDS TO STAY THAT WAY THAnk you for your time

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9680    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 I fully support the National Parks Conservation Association in their position on this proposal expressed in this letter:  
 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:** 9681    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:32:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9682	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:33:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9683	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:33:19						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I have had the pleasure of walking, hiking, camping, kayaking, photographing landscapes and wildlife and just plain sitting and enjoying the peace and beauty of so many of our National Parks. It would be a real shame to deny those opportunities to future citizens because some people have to rev up their engines. I've talked to people who own ORVs and they've told me of their adventures on private lands of people who share their interest. I think this is quite reasonable. They get to have their fun with their friends on their lands. While our National Parks belong to all our citizens it is the responsibility of the National Park Service to manage the environment and wildlife to be enjoyed by all.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9684	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:35:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Keep off road vehicles out of Cape Hatteras National Park, it's a park not a dirt track racing strip.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9685	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:35:14						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please protect Cape Hatteras so it can be kept in pristine condition for future generations.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9686	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Odell, Katharine O						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:35:20						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>As a former cottage owner in Southern Shores, NC and a lover of the National Seashore, I cannot believe that you would consider opening this beautiful land to ATRs or other off-road vehicles. It would lead to a quick death of the ecosystem - not only the demise of the shoreline but also of the many shorebirds that nest in the dunes (who will be unduly distracted by the commotion and noise), the turtles that must make a run to the shore to survive, the horseshoe crabs that will be in danger of these road people picking them up by their tails for fun, etc. etc. Don't let this happen. The National Seashore will be just a joke - a national runway for off road vehicles. The stakes are TOO HIGH to let a renegade group of humans onto this land.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9687	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:36:05						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>National Park Service's Planning, Environment, and Public Comment Site)</p> <p>URGENT: DON'T LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE! From Fleur Palau</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9688	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 18:36:11						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all</p>						

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9689      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Jones, Jack B

**Received:** May,07,2010 18:36:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To the National Park Service:

As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,

Jack Jones, Retired U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service

**Correspondence ID:** 9690      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Hinson, Samantha L

**Received:** May,07,2010 18:36:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,

Samantha L. Hinson

**Correspondence ID:** 9691      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** guzman, carl

**Received:** May,07,2010 18:37:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9692    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Walls, Jim  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:38:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 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 people 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:** 9693    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Williams, Nicholas M  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:38:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
 Sincerely,  
 Nicholas M. Williams

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9694    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:38:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,  
 I understand 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.  
 If this management plan is implemented, Cape Hatteras National Seashore will be dominated, and decimated, by ORV use for the next 20 years!  
 I find this outcome completely unacceptable. National Parks are created to preserve natural resources as their primary goal. To turn these natural places primarily over to vehicle use does not make any sense at all! Not for those who go to the seashore for peace and quiet nor for the wildlife that depend on this habitat for food, shelter, and nesting sites. Furthermore, vehicles are dangerous for people and wildlife.  
 The ORV management plan should place greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.  
 Please do not implement the proposed management plan, I beg of you! This is my seashore as much as anyone else that lives in these United States.  
 Thank you for considering my comments. And please include them in the official record.  
 Sincerely, James Boone

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9695    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wagner, Linda  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:40:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Cape Hatteras National Seashore has long been my family's favorite vacation area. This area is one of our most frequently visited natural areas.  
 All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement place off road vehicle use over all other visitors. This results in an unbalanced plan and does nothing to protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
- Cape Hatteras is a national gem of marsh, beach, woodland and wildlife. It must be preserved for generations after our own time. Allowing off road vehicle use will degrade and destroy the area irrevocably. Put the motorized vehicle play space in commercial and developed areas, not in our national natural areas.
- Thank you for review of my remarks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9696    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:41:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9697    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a North Carolinian I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

I can assure you the people who want greater vehicular access are most simply too fat and too lazy to walk. Or, they want their RV on the beach so they don't have to walk back to get a beer. I've been there. These people are a mess.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9698    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:41:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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



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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9699    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:41:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9700    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:41:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9701    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:41:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9702    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Levin, Jon  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:41:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
 \*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9703    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:41:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9704    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:41:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9705    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:41:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate being allowed to comment on the plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. An alternative plan which provides more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife is important to me.  
 If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more

walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families 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.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9706    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 18:41:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9707    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 18:41:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9708    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 18:41:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9709    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 18:41:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9710    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:41:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
**Provide Equal Access for All Visitors:** Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
**Put Natural Resources First:** Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
**Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery:** A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9711    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:41:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
**Provide Equal Access for All Visitors:** Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
**Put Natural Resources First:** Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
**Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery:** A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9712    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:41:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
**Provide Equal Access for All Visitors:** Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9713    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:41:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9714    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:41:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In addition to being a waste of a finite resource (oil), off road vehicles destroy habitat, frighten wildlife, and degrade precious natural resources. Off road vehicles should be restricted to areas that are already degraded. Cape Hatteras National Seashore is not a degraded area and should not have off road vehicles damaging its beauty and destroying the habitat of its wildlife.  
Please exclude off road vehicles from Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9715    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:42:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I urge you to adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting that which makes Cape Hatteras so special--abundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9716    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:43:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9717    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Fiorini, Mark  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:43:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National

Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9718    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Schroeder, Gary W  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:44:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There are plenty of roads for vehicles. I go to Cape Hatteras National Seashore to GET AWAY from the trappings of civilization, including cars. I do not want to hear the noise of off road vehicles or have pollution from off road vehicles on the beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9719    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:44:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** no, no, no! in the name of john muir, don't do it! keep the quiet serenity of the shore. no cars, no ATVs, nothing but sun and sky and sea. Please!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9720    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:44:20  
**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.  
Sincerely, Cindy Kendrick

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9721    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Clark, Frank  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:44:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think that getting in bed with the extreme left, and a ethics-challenged judge who is prone to be overruled --- against the residents and visitors, as well as 80% of the public is a very risky position to take. When the pendulum turns; and it will, he limb you are putting yourself and the NPS on will look very small indeed.  
Do the right thing. Treat the Outer Banks - North, Pea Island, dredge islands and south as an ecological entity. Follow the peer reviewed science, and the best outcome for the residents, wildlife, visitors, and the NPS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9722    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:44:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9723    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Driving ORVs in national parks along national seashores where they harm federally protected shore birds on federally protected land conflicts directly with the founding mission statement of our National Parks. As the National Parks website informs us about the act creating the National Park Service that President Wilson signed almost a century ago:  
"This "Organic Act" of August 25, 1916, states that "the Service thus established shall promote and regulate the use of Federal areas known as national parks ... to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
<http://www.nps.gov/legacy/mission.html>  
Permitting people to drive over and disturb critical nesting areas of shore birds, sea turtles, many endangered, violates the National Parks Service mission.  
Common sense and economics dictate that we should preserve these fragile ecosystems and protect the birds. Even if it were all about economics -- there is plenty of evidence that eco-tourism is economically and ecologically good for communities. If what we need to do as a nation is grow a green economy -- here is a perfect way to demonstrate that. It is un-green to permit the use of gasoline-powered vehicles on a fragile seashore.  
I think our National Parks should promote "take care of wildlife" as an activity and priority for our National Parks.  
I suggest we create a public campaign to enlist the ORV drivers and all community members to participate in healthy physical exercise maintaining and protecting the shore birds and other creatures of this crucial and delicate habitat -- a place important not just to North Carolinians, but to everyone on this planet. I volunteer to lead and facilitate this effort.  
As a citizen of North Carolina and of these United States, I ask you to ban ORV use in the Hatteras National Seashore so that we have a seashore of value to the generations that follow us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9724    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:44:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9725    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:44:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9726    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:44:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras beaches are part of a Recreational Area set aside by the Cong ress, with land that donated to the government. This land was donated and entrusted to the government with the understanding that beach access would continue to be allowed. Failure on the NPS side to create a Off Road Management plan is simply a failure of the government to perform its responsibilities. Now the PUBLIC are the ones suffering. The only acceptable option is to leave the surf zone and access open to all. Develop areas for bird habitat more spoil islands, clear the vegetation around the salt pond. These birds are nor endangered or even threstened. Nor are they even NATIVE. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9727    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Nilsen, Jeffrey M  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,  
Jeffrey Nilsen 148 Michele Circle NOvato, CA 94947 Cell phone number 415.378.6187

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9728    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:45:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am vacationing at Indian Beach this week, and I find the fact they allow vehicles on the beach not only dangerous to children, but destructive to the environment and disruptive to enjoyment of the beach. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9729    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:46:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel that allowing off-road vehicles access to the beach and dune areas will degrade them and also cause them to be more susceptible to erosion. In addition the noise and excessive traffic will disturb the nesting areas, animals, and could destroy the native plants. Please do not allow off-roading in the above areas, people who really wish to see and enjoy the beauty will be willing to walk and do their observing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9730    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, Dena  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:48:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all



visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9731    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please look within yourself and use your authority and influence to protect wildlife and pedestrian thoroughfares from the destruction of Off Road Vehicles in Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

**Correspondence ID:** 9732    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Freeland, Penny

**Received:** May,07,2010 18:52:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I object to your preferred plan F, to restrict beach access to ORV's, pedestrians and pets, at Cape Point. Cape Point is one of the most famous fishing areas in this country. Closing it to fishermen and other visitors will hurt the economy of Hatteras Island. Furthermore, Cape Point is a huge part of our island culture, something you have given only two paragraphs to in your plan. There is no science to support such closings. In fact, the plover population has gone down, since the court decree restrictions. This is because the plover and other birds need us on the beach. We keep predators away and take care of the wildlife.

All we have here are the beaches. This is not like other National Parks, in that there are families who live here and earn their livings. Why put restrictions on us that are worse than parks like, Assateague, where businesses are not at risk? Why do our birds require 771 acres of protection, when the ones at other parks need only 200 meters?

Why haven't studies been done on the impact of the economy, as required by law?

Please don't close Cape Point or put any restrictions on it. Go back to plan A and continue to protect the birds, without harming the economy.

**Correspondence ID:** 9733    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 18:52:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I am absolutely against using an Off Road Vehicle Management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you. Sincerely, Felicity Brach

**Correspondence ID:** 9734    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Knezha, Lisa

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am a former fourth grade teacher in North Carolina. One of the things that my students loved the most was the study of the coastal areas, as we were landlocked in Asheville. The waves, the sands and the lighthouses all called to them as no other part of North Carolina did. Please protect it.

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) Protect the seashore from noise, pollution and the disruption of environment by banning all Off Road vehicles.

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not for people to ride rural motorcycles on. It is absolutely

essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and do not allow smelly, loud and abnoxious off road vehicles on the beaches AT ALL!

3) If the final plan does allow any amount of Off Road vehicle use, a follow up study needs to be doen within a year to see what damage has been done to the wild area, wild life and visitor experience of the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. The National Park Service is underfunded and overused, so your dedication to preserving "America's Last Best Places" is admirable. Please preserve Cape Hatteras for more generations to come, and more 4th grade students to grow to love in their studies of NC History.

Sincerely, Lisa Knezha

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9735    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
 \*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9736    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 18:53:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9737    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 18:53:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please let the National Park Conservation Association put their Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan in place at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management than the ORV management plan of the National Park Service.  
 Sincerely,  
 Dorothy Holtzman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9738    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Peralta, Sharon L  
**Received:** May.07,2010 18:54:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D,

if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9739    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Odry, Susanna  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:54:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We need ORV's as we need hunches on our backs. It is one thing to have a vehicle to be able to get around when we are no longer capable to walk, but ORV's do nothing to help human kind and they are not made for people to enjoy the beauty that surrounds us but to destroy it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9740    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:55:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As former resident in pediatrics at UNC-Chapel Hill who spent four years in central North Carolina, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9741    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Murray,  
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be needed to achieve this goal. Thank you for evaluating the options to improve the environmental conditions at one of the greatest destinations in the United States of America.  
However, with the aforementioned said, please consider the responses you choose carefully. Minimalist environmental management approaches have worked well throughout the United States' National Parks. Closing extensive sections of beaches, the sound, and water ways will strip away the very nature and reason for why we appreciate the land in its current state. It can be said with great certainty that all frequent and casual users of this place intend to preserve its natural beauty and respect its wildlife.  
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.  
Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.  
If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?  
Kind Regards,  
Mike

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9742    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 18:56:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a former national park ranger, member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the

0011501

wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Kristen Andersen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9743    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9744    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 18:59:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow the use of off-road vehicles in Cape Hatteras NS. Keep the the seashore natural and not filled with the annoying roar of these dangerous vehicles. I am speaking from personal experience of having the quiet of my rural neighborhood shattered by the engines of these "toys". In addition, my experience includes watching unthinking parents allow their young children who under the legal driving age to pilot these dangerous vehicles without adult supervision. I urge you to ban these vehicles from the area. Respectfully, Elise Evans

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9745    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 18:59:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The beaches and sand dunes of Cape Hatteras are among the country's national treasures. They provide habitat for a myriad of animals and plants, some of which have very specific requirements for survival. Opening untrammelled areas to off-road vehicles will deal a death blow to some of these species, and will seriously mar the recreational experience of non-vehicle users because of noise, air pollution, and safety issues. Please do not allow ORVs to use the pristine parts of Cape Hatteras as their playground!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9746    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Corbat, Richard  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,  
Richard Corbat

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9747    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Freeland, Penny  
**Received:** May.07,2010 18:59:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a homeowner on Hatteras Island. I bought my home here, because it is one of the most beautiful places in America. It is a dream come true for me. You are threatening to ruin this dream with your proposed beach access restrictions. In addition to Hatteras Island being my dream, it is a dream to millions of visitors. It is an asset to the country, state and county. It is one of the top choices of vacation places from which Americans have to choose. What you are proposing to do in your plan F, is like closing Disneyland. This is Disneyland for sports enthusiasts, like kite boarders and surfers. It is Disneyland for fishermen. It is Disneyland for couples in love. It is Disneyland for dogs. I could go on!  
My point is you are stealing a gem from the American people, without the science to support your beach access restrictions. There is no evidence that these closing will help with bird populations; in fact, the evidence is to the contrary.  
In this day and age, you would do better to figure out how to stop oil from reaching our shores, if you are really interested in helping birds.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9748    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** von Giebel, Robert G  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Send Your Comments Today!  
DEADLINE TUESDAY!!  
(The link above will take you to the National Park Service's Planning, Environment, and Public Comment Site) Dear Robert,  
**URGENT: 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 advocates--like you--fail to take action, Cape Hatteras National Seashore will be dominated by ORV use for the next 20 years!  
NPCA seeks an ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.  
Take Action Now: Submit your comments to the NPS by midnight (Mountain Time), Tuesday, May 11, and urge them 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.  
Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9749    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Haupt, Lois  
**Received:** May.07,2010 19:01:20  
**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.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9750	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 19:01:23						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Recreational vehicles have no place cruising up and down a pristine beach, especially when others are trying to enjoy nature. And, more importantly, it is a turtle breeding ground. Would you drive a recreational vehicle through any human maternity ward??? Show some respect for intelligent life other than man... Strive to save and preserve rather than mindlessly consume and destroy!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9751	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 19:04:11						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not allow off road trucks on these buetiful beaches. Keep it to walkers and runners so we do not have to worry about getting run over or the noise of trucks on the beach.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9752	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Freeland, Penny						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 19:04:18						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I object to your night beach driving restrictions. The culture of this Island has always included the ability to drive on the beach and fish at night. We have always coexisted with the wildlife here; restricting night driving will do nothing to help with the numbers of sea turtles or plover. Just fence off nests like other beaches do. There is no science to support these restrictions!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9753	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Clark, Patricia						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 19:04:30						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We, and other village residents walk the beaches on almost a daily basis. When walking, we carry back trash that floats in, or is disposed of by thoughtless visitors. Every couple of weeks we take a pick up down the beach to get larger items. We participate in community beach cleaning days. We see some of our neighbors who are NPS employes do the same on their own time, but we have never seen the NPS trucks stop and pick up trash. Admittedly the NPS does maintain a good dumpster disposal system at the ramps, but it is the residents that fill these up. The proposed vehicle regulations, and corridors will put an end to this. The beaches will come to resemble southern New Jersey, and who wants to visit there? Please think things through, and come up with a good science driven, peer reviewed management system. Come to think about it, what we have now is pretty good.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9754	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Rideout, James						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 19:05:22						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	ORV are a disaster on our beautiful beaches. They are for people to enjoy & not be subject to people running wildly in their motorized vehicles						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9755	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Burr, Eric L						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 19:05:27						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a retired national park ranger and naturalist, I know how important it is for parks to be able to document public support for quiet experiences in our parks. I'm also familiar with the damage potential to wildlife and its habitat caused by vehicular traffic, especially off roads. Please count this letter as supporting only quiet, non motorized access to your beaches.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9756	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		
<b>Name:</b>	Koenigsberg, Lynne						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 19:05:30						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Sincerely, Lynne Koenigsberg Florida						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9757	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596		

**Name:** Frachtman, Brianna  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:05:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9758    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wallace, Deb  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

4) These places belong to all Americans. There are precious few of them left, where I and my family can go bird-watching and hiking without noise fumes and folks trying to run us down. Please don't let this one be ruined, too.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
 Deb Wallace

**Correspondence ID:** 9759    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:06:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9760    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:07:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe enough of our beach front property is used by the human species pleasure in the form of ORV and vehicle usage. It is critical that we learn to share with wildlife. Sea birds and sea turtles need the habitat worse than we need another playground to drive our SUV's and ORV's around on. Please preserve the natural beauty of our beaches and let those who want to stroll on a beach without the noise and disturbance of ORV's and vehicle traffic.

**Correspondence ID:** 9761    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Schlesinger, Sybil E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:07:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow noisy off-road vehicles in Cape Hatteras National Park. Cities are already full of noise; we go to National Parks for peace, recreation and quiet. So few spaces on earth are free of mechanical engine noises. Please help us keep the last few places pristine.

**Correspondence ID:** 9762    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mehlman, Jean P  
**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." This to me is a critical point. While some ORV owners are responsible, too many of them are not responsible. The Cape Hatteras beaches are very sensitive areas that need special protection.  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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!  
Jean Mehlman Greenville, SC

**Correspondence ID:** 9763    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
I value National Parks as areas to which I can go for quiet and relaxation. I regularly visit National Parks during my vacations and have made it a life goal to eventually make it to all of the National Parks in the US. While I acknowledge that other park users use parks differently than I do, the needs of all park users should be balanced. Currently, the management of Cape Hatteras privileges one group of park users over others.  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9764    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:08:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Do not allow off road vehicles.....

**Correspondence ID:** 9765    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:11:10



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Do the right thing. Please!

**Correspondence ID:** 9766    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 19:11:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9767    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 19:11:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9768    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 19:11:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9769    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:11:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9770    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:11:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9771    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:11:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9772    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:11:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please restrict vehicle traffic on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The National Park Service has a mission to protect our natural heritage. Please don't allow vehicular access that will damage the seashore, and destroy the enjoyment of the area by those seeking to escape the noise of everyday life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9773    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:11:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9774    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:11:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9775    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:11:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9776    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:11:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9777    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:11:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9778    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Cape Hatteras belongs to the animals and I'm sorry, but for once humans should not be allowed to take that home away. It would be an absolute tragedy to lose this precious place all because a bunch of rednecks want to drive their big trucks in the sand. Stop and think for a minute about what's on the line here and it should be obvious to any fool that the wildlife deserves to win this one.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9779    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:11:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9780    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 19:11:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles are destructive to the peaceful nature, humans as well as animals enjoying the environment. Please protect this area for all to enjoy. Let them walk like the rest of us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9781    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Arnold, Richard A  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
I write to you not as a resident of Hatteras, but a Midwesterner who has twice visited this unique American treasure. It is my fondest hope that this area, as well as all our national parks, will be available to succeeding generations in at least as pristine condition as this area is now seen.  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9782    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bates, Scott R  
**Received:** May.07.2010 19:12:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not let off-road vehicles destroy the peace and damage the sensitive environment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9783    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hanson, Art  
**Received:** May.07.2010 19:13:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9784    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Jones, Johanna L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:13:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Cape Hatteras National Seashore must not be taken over by ORV use. I urge you to devise a thoughtful, well-vetted ORV Management Plan which will save our seashore and its wildlife, winged and swimming. Human beings are privileged guests in this fragile environment. They must, must behave in ways which are not destructive to this precious environs and its habitat.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9785    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Oakman, Diane  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:13:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow this fantastic area to be damaged

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9786    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** SCHLAGMAN, DANIEL  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:14:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9787    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:14:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9788    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:14:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9789	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 19:14:25						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9790	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 19:14:30						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. Alternative D will provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and lead to less disturbance of wildlife. If Alternative D is not chosen, it remains crucial that the following principles underpin the park's formulation of its final plan: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9791	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May.07.2010 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to						

us. We have had the opportunity in person to go on birding walks with birding guides to see first hand this crucial Cape Hatteras seashore wildlife area nesting and flyway for many common and many rare sea birds and home for seashore turtles and seashore wildlife. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9792    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 19:14:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9793    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 19:14:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correspondence ID:** 9794    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 19:14:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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



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

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

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

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

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9795    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 19:14:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
**To Whom It May Concern:**  
I can't believe that people have to beg to save endangered species! We NEED to do this. In doing so, we are SAVING humans as well.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9796    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Robinson, Bina A  
**Received:** May.07.2010 19:15:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off-road vehicles are a source of pollution, a disturbance and an annoyance. They should not be allowed on public lands where their recreational use interferes with the enjoyment of other visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9797    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 19:16:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep vehicles off the beaches. People need to walk.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9798    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Severini, Nina M  
**Received:** May.07.2010 19:16:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the

pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9799    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Harvey, M & J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:16:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please allow Nature to exist naturally, without the noisy and destructive effects of Off road Vehicles. Nature's animals cannot exist peacefully when you allow loud engines to disrupt the peace of Nature.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9800    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:17:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please adopt the modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting that which makes Cape Hatteras so special--abundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9801    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Crossley, Jean  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Help!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9802    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Waltzer, Mark L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:17:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
I have vacationed in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore area. It is an incredibly valuable asset to our national parks, especially in the nearly undisturbed portions.  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9803    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:18:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Many, many years ago we had a wonderful time family camping on Cape Hatteras. We very much want others to continue to have the same opportunity. ORVs will be noisy and tear up the terrain!  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9804    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Delutt, Ans  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:18:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Just what will it take?

**Correspondence ID:** 9805    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Perricelli, Claire  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:18:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Enough of our earth is over run with our polluting and noisy vehicles. We definitely do not need them in the unroaded areas of our parks. We need to restrain ourselves and save some places in something close to pristine form for our progeny.

**Correspondence ID:** 9806    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
In re the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I am opposed to allowing the use of ORV's on the beach. The Seashore is a nationally treasured resource with beautiful sand beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the Outer Banks of North Carolina. It is an area cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, beachcombers, fishermen, and multitudes of others who visit the area to enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement PRIVILEGE Off Road Vehicle users OVER all other visitors. The approach fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally loved. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D would be viable if modified to include the following:  
First, the National Park Service must fulfill its responsibility under the Organic Act, and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation, to protect ALL visitors, wildlife, and the habitat that supports them. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over recreational off road vehicle use. Any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." This is not the case with ORV's which have high impacts on the environment, including noise, beach erosion, disturbance of nesting habitats and behavior, and pollution, among others, reducing opportunities for quiet recreation, and degrading the natural values of the Cape.  
Second, Congress 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...." ORV use is inconsistent with this intent. It is essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras.  
Third, the final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to manage the wildlife resources to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Once again, recreational ORV use is inconsistent with protection of endangered sea turtles and shorebirds, and other seashore flora and fauna.  
Please do not permit ORV use in Cape Hatteras National Seashore.  
Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 9807    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:19:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To all concerned,  
I have been a visitor and resident to coastal communities all my life, including the west coasts of WA, OR, CA and Baja California as well as many of the Southeast Atlantic coasts. The wildlife and natural beauty that accompanies these places is the reason that I go here for the sense of awe, peace and inspiration they bring to me.  
I am planning to visit Cape Hatteras this summer as part of a family reunion vacation. I would be heartbroken to know that the place I was enjoying was not given all the respect and protection it deserves. The wildlife and plant lives of or coastlines are already under so many circumstantial stresses with pollution and the recent oilspill, that I don't think it is conscionable to bring further challenges to them for the enjoyment for the few.  
I do understand how much enjoyment the sport of off-road-vehicles gives to people. My father is actually a member of the Nebraska ORV association. So I have heard the opions from both sides. I am a fair believer of listening to both sides and reaching a fair compromise. So it is for this reason that I ask if ORV are allowed any access to the Natl. Seashore it be highly regulated and NOT allowed during wildlife sensitive seasons, ie nesting and hatching seasons.  
Thank you for listening, Angela Kubalek

**Correspondence ID:** 9808    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:20:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Ben D'Ooge

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9809	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 19:20:42						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."</p> <p>Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>Nancy Keim Comley</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9810	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Coleman, Carl W						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 19:21:17						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Greetings; In short, lack of protection from these vehicles is tearing up countryside, including the Appalachian Trail &amp; national &amp; state parks. DON'T LET THEM TEAR UP OUR BEACHES, too!</p> <p>Thank You,</p> <p>Carl W. Coleman, U.S.C.G, Aux. &amp; Sierra Club</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9811	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 19:21:26						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Please limit use of off road vehicles on Cape Hatteras. We have so few places left where machines and pollution don't encroach. Please preserve some natural areas for endangered wildlife and endangered humans.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9812	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 19:23:02						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is very special due to its abundant and endangered wildlife, and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore. The predominant sound is from the waves rolling up on the seashore (with the exception of the sound of the traffic on the nearby highway.) Off road vehicles have no positive contribution to make to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9813	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Lighthall, Tim H						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 19:24:08						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."</p> <p>Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9814	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						

**Received:** May,07,2010 19:25:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9815      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Nettesheim, Barbara

**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. This approach is very unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service must not ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "EXCEPT FOR CERTAIN PORTIONS of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , THE SAID AREA SHALL BE PERMANENTLY RESERVED AS A PRIMITIVE WILDERNESS...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

The disturbance to the area mentioned and the damage these vehicles make are very detrimental to dunes, plants, and animals, and to humans who enjoy the beauty, the clean air, the view, and natural sounds of the protected Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

We all have legs to walk, and even if one has to carry one's fishing gear for a few hundred feet that should not be a problem - people have done it for centuries!

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9816      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Caine, Lisa

**Received:** May,07,2010 19:26:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9817      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A

**Received:** May,07,2010 19:26:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9818    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07,2010 19:27:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Sincerely,

Jeff Bjorn

**Correspondence ID:** 9819    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May.07,2010 19:27:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9820    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Birchard, Ethan K

**Received:** May.07,2010 19:27:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

Thanks for taking comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Please, please do not give ORV use the preference implicit in the current alternatives. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches,

salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. As they stand, the approaches in the draft approaches are unbalanced and fail to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Ethan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9821    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Tuomey, James & Ann Ellen  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:28:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE! Do we have to sacrifice yet another relatively pristine and safe habitat for wildlife to the polluting and destructive toys of an unconcerned and selfish few,  
 Save Hatteras!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9822    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:28:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
 Sincerely, Lori Feeley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9823    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Otis, David W  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:31:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** People, not machines.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9824    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:31:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please help

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9825    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:31:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9826    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray  
 URGENT: DON'T LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!  
 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.  
 ,As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the

draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason. "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9827    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:33:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras will suffer degrading ruts and trash, that will blow into the Ocean too, if off-road vehicle travel is opened up further. The smaller footprint of beach walking and sitting will be enough to protect the fragile coast and allow access too.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9828    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:34:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** If you look about you, you will see nothing but dwindling resources of beauty and wonder in these United States. Why? Because the almighty dollar lining the elite pockets of non-caring people takes precedence over the beauty of our precious lands. We have to stop this carnage.  
Kathlene Prescott

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9829    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:34:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** While I don't live on Hatteras Island, my family goes back four generations in Avon, NC. As a child, I would spend every summer with my grandparents in Avon in the late 70's and early 80's. We purchased our family's home place in Avon ten years ago. We built a new home on the property and currently rent it to tourists.  
I have seen many changes that have occurred over the years. Some have been positive and some negative. Due to the increased number of visitors to the Outer Banks, I do believe that we must protect this place and its wildlife. It is very important for future generations to be able to see and appreciate the unspoiled beauty and wildlife of the Outer Banks.  
I DO SUPPORT limiting recreational vehicle access on the beaches. I have been to many different cities and beach locations over the years. This is the only place that I know of that allows visitors such unrestricted use of the beaches. While there are visitors that abide by posted laws and restrictions, the ones that do not can harm the wildlife irreversible during times when they are most vulnerable.  
I realize this may be detrimental in the short term to my property's rentals, but in the long run it will preserve the wildlife. This preservation will ensure visitors will be able to continue to enjoy this area for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9830    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Sullivan, Robert A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:34:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The sound of combustion engines is stressful and all too common. We go to parks and recreational areas to escape this noise. The effects of vehicles on land and wildlife are not desirable. It is time to stop abusing the planet. We must allow safe and quiet environments to flourish.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9831    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kaiser, Katherine E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
I am an avid traveler, a proud owner of an annual National Park pass each and every year, and my family has been vacationing along the Outer Banks for generations. We enjoy the pristine surroundings and we value the vast array of wildlife in the area. We, along with so many other tourists, are happy to spend our tourism dollars in an area of our country where these natural resources are seen as the valuable and irreplaceable assets that they are. We are careful to be sure our time there only includes activities that do not disturb the wildlife that is already struggling to overcome large environmental hazards. I would hope that the National Park Service would be the line of defense between destructive off-road vehicles and the less-invasive pedestrian visitors. I, along with future generations, would mourn the loss of serenity that is found at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.  
I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of



the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Katherine E. Kaiser

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9832    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mathews, Jennifer L  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers - like myself and my family, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points:  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9833    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:35:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We add our voices to the great number of citizens who do not want the sound, speed, and fumes of off-road vehicles contaminating our natural habitats and National parks, which are, after all, set aside to preserve America's history and natural beauty. That is the reason that they are set aside. We urge you to protect our parks and other natural properties from uncontrolled pollution and the danger of motorized vehicles driven by careless speed maniacs.  
Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9834    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Austin, Laird A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:36:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sincerest Regards, Laird A. Austin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9835    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wright, Kirstin E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:36:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D,

if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9836    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:36:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please select one of the no action alternatives that keeps the maximum amount of OHV riding available to the public. This historic use should be maintained, subject only to the needs of species protection.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9837    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:36:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** If you cannot imagine ORVs on the beach, try imagining the kind of people that you would have at your home if you had a NASCAR dinner party. Not a palatable outdoors crowd.  
Don't spoil it for the rest of us by permitting motorheads off the roads.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9838    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:37:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9839    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kessler, Susan  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:37:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9840    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Coon, John  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:37:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** RV use must be very limited or banned in order to preserve the Cape for generations to come.

**Correspondence ID:** 9841    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
I am writing to you to ask your thoughtful consideration about preserving the beauty, tranquility, plants and animals of the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. These are very valuable to me and to many people I know, and once they are ruined, they cannot be recovered. They are national treasures for us and the future generations.  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9842    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Wittenberg, Sara  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:38:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow ORVs on the seashore! It would ruin the pristine habitat so much wildlife depends on!

**Correspondence ID:** 9843    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mink, Daniel G  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the Cape Hatteras NS ORV draft plan. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Our national parks, seashores, forests, and other public lands should primarily be area of sanctuary for wildlife and native plants, that can be enjoyed by humans in low-impact ways. The use of ORVs is definitely not low impact, and should not be allowed on our public lands. There are plenty of other places for people to use ORVs, they should not be allowed in the few natural areas left in this country. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 9844    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:39:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I love out outdoors. I love being where few humans have left their foot print. I love being where the most dominate sounds come from the floral and fauna. Please keep it that way from my great grand children. K.I. Rasmussen

**Correspondence ID:** 9845    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Fischer, Lynn  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:39:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras is unique and beautiful; it must be protected so that we and future generations can enjoy and appreciate it. Off road vehicles have no place there. Its tranquility for people and wildlife must be respected.

**Correspondence ID:** 9846    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hardman, Peggy J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:40:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I know Cape Hatteras; love the wonderful quiet respite it used to be. Now, with this off-road proposal what little of its pristine beauty remains will be

not only compromised, but likely destroyed. The seashore is what visitors want to see; the sound of the sea what they want to hear. The smell of sea spray and the wildlife should not be mixed with oil, gas, and/or diesel. There are hundreds of miles of accessible areas to off-road vehicles in the state without destroying Hatteras. Please, I do not live in that region anymore, but when I visit, I want the Cape as of old; leave the noise and gas junkies off the area, thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9847    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:41:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9848    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:41:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9849    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:41:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9850    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:41:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9851    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:41:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9852    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:41:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9853    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:41:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9854    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:41:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9855    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:41:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9856    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:41:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9857    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. As a family we took many camping vacations. If at all possible we would include a stay or at least a visit to any National Park in the area we were visiting. We want future generations to have the same opportunity.  
Dean and Della Sandahl Lincoln, NE 68507

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9858    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hass, Marjorie A  
**Received:** May.07,2010 19:41:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not let off road vehicles dominate Cape Hatteras. We need for this place to remain pristine for posterity to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9859    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 19:41:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9860    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 19:41:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 9861    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Let's support science-based policies, not vehicle-industry-based policies. Green: yes. Greed: no. Preserve our American land: yes. Destroy our American land: no. Simple.  
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 9862    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:41:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 9863    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:41:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 9864    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:41:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which



was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9865    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:41:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9866    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9867    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:42:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D,

if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9868    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Traum, Norman  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified so as to recognize that the intent of Congress was to protect visitors' experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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 for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, Norman Traum

**Correspondence ID:** 9869    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:44:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 9870    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:44:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9871    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:44:32  
**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:** 9872    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:44:32  
**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:** 9873    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:44:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9874    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:44:32  
**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:** 9875    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:44:32  
**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:** 9876    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
Dear Superintendent Murray,  
Please consider following the recommendations of the Audubon Society on the issue of ORVs on Cape Hatteras. Wildlife considerations should take precedence over the recreational wishes of a few vocal enthusiasts. My family and I vacation often on the North Carolina coast in order to view and enjoy the magnificent natural beauty of your coastal areas. We stay in coastal hotels and eat in coastal restaurants. We buy souvenirs in coastal shops. Overall, we feel that we contribute to the tourist economy of your state.  
We do not travel to NC in order to race up and down the beach on vehicles; we travel for the sake of the chance of sighting sea turtles and for the pleasure of sharing your beaches with their natural inhabitants-- the coastal birds. It would be sad for us if the ORV users got their way on this issue because it would give the message that NC doesn't care about the wealth of its natural habitats, a realization that would make us vacation elsewhere.  
Sincerely,  
Begona Lathbury  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9877    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Griswold, Dave  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:46:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9878    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Vincent, Joseph I  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:46:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Keep ORVs, ATVs, tanks, motorcycles, jet skis, 3-wheelers, 4-wheelers, busses and every other type of motorized craft off the beaches and off anything that's not a currently paved road. Why have a "national seashore" if the only aim is to destroy it and the precious life and lives it holds?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9879    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:46:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No, no, a thousand times please NO to off-road vehicles on Cape Hatteras beach. There is no place for those on that beach; it would cause irreparable damage in every possible way.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9880    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Urban, Richard G  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:47:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9881    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 19:48:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Ken Sandri

**Correspondence ID:** 9882    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. I remember visiting it many years ago and enjoying its serenity. OR vehicles really do not belong in quiet, wilderness place like this. (See #2 below.) All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9883    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations," something which ORV use does not do.

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,

Robin A. Vosburg

**Correspondence ID:** 9884    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I am against this ORV plan as it is currently drafted.

When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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 for accepting my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9885    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Ross, Linda R  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Cape Hatteras is one of the finest beach areas in this country. A place of serene beauty and peace. Adding the noise and disruption of ORV's will seriously degrade the quality of this special area. Not to mention the disruption to the wildlife whose claim to it precedes ours. Please do not turn it over to those uninterested in its unique qualities and see it as merely another landscape to decimate with motorized vehicles.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today.

Thanks again!

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9886    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:52:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Thank you,

Sharon M. Fetter Puyallup, WA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9887    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:52:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please, absolutely NO ORV in Cape Hatteras Natinal Seashore Park!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9888    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:53:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The wild relatively unspoiled beaches on the surf sound 20 miles up and down from Avon have been a haven and refuge for me and for the people I windsurf and para-sail with.

The fact that we can drive our gear near the dunes has always been a plus.

BUT on beaches where dogs are thought to be a danger to the dunes when they are off-leash, it's insane to allow unrestricted year round access to all

beaches. What about the turtles in the spring? will big cars driving over their eggs improve the success of the nests?  
 Will spilled oil, used tires, and gasoline fumes make the beaches a draw for tourist and family recreation?  
 Keep the national parks and wildlife sanctuary a sanctuary for wildlife and non-motorized recreation. The current vehicle access to the beaches is more than enough.  
 Respectfully  
 Hilary Silvert Newell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9889    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Samenfeld, Herbert W  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:53:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Both my wife and I remember our visits to Cape Hatteras as a time in the warm sun with the rolling waves and the endless sandy beach. We do not envision ORV's ruining the experience with their noise and their tracks through the sand. Please do not introduce or condone ORV's in this protected area. We hope that it will remain the joyful place we have known. We do not believe that these vehicles are desirable or necessary in one of our national treasures. Thank you in advance for protecting the American people's precious possessions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9890    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lyle, Kent  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:54:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. The Outer Banks have enough to cope with capricious nature of the wind and surf; they don't need any extra stress from vehicles in sensitive areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9891    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:55:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Why do our pristine areas have to be polluted by off road vehicles, whether by noise, foul air or terrain destruction. Yellowstone is a good example!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9892    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Bannister, Julie  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:55:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9893    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird



watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Kathleen Carroll

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9894    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:57:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am very troubled that you would allow off-road motorized vehicles on the fragile sands of this area. Any plan for this National Seashore must guard against the damage done by these vehicles. I have seen first hand the damage they can do here in New Hampshire. Please safe-guard the fragile seashore and preserve the quiet, the grasses, birds, and the serenity of this wonderful place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9895    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:57:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9896    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:58:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Do not destroy the enviroment that we live in. I camp with ounger children and like to show them all wonderful things that are natural and if you destroy the environment there will be nothing for children to enjoy anymore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9897    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Delaney, Patrick  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:58:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There are enough places for people to take their off-road vehicles without opening up more in our National Park and Recreation Areas. There has to be a limit on what forms of "recreation" we allow in these special places. For the Park Service to allow this kind of activity brings us back to the days and mentality that allowed the firefall in Yosemite or tried to turn the Yellowstone bears into a circus act. To do anything that encourages this activity is to abdicate your responsibility to the land that you control and the enjoyment of them by future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9898    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Reedy, Laraine  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:58:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please stop the destruction of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore by the overuse of off road vehicles. The erosive capacities of these vehicles is irreversible damaging to the fragile ecosystem of these Outer Banks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9899    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A

**Received:** May,07,2010 19:58:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is a travesty! The beach is not meant to sustain man made vehicles! It is the one place that nature needs to be left alone. Please think again and stop this destructive act today!

**Correspondence ID:** 9900    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Dymkowski, Evelyn J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:58:59  
**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:** 9901    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** POWELL, MARTHA  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:59:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National

Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9902    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Novkov, Russell J  
**Received:** May,07,2010 19:59:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please save the animals in the parks.

**Correspondence ID:** 9903    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hulbert, Charles R  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Charles Hulbert

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9904    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Kabcenell, Brian  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:00:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9905    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Goike, Karen E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:00:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an ORV owner, I know we already have enough places to ride. Leave the beaches alone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9906    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hulbert, Charles R  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Charles Hulbert

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9907    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:01:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There should be no off-road vehicles on public beaches. They are a nuisance, and only a small number of people like them. Keep them away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9908    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:01:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with

its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9909	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:03:35						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</li> <li>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</li> <li>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>It is my opinion that foot traffic is a lot less destructive to wild life and the environment than ORV traffic. Beaches and dunes are very fragile and should not be subject to ORV traffic in my opinion.</p>						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9910	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:03:43						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please protect this valuable environment from extraneous threats. Thank you for your attention.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9911	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:03:50						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras is one of the most beautiful beaches I have ever camped on. It was pristine and full of natural wildlife and peaceful quiet. I would hate to see it ruined by off road vehicles which are usually driven by people who have no appreciation for the natural beauty or wildlife that surrounds them. They tend to be thrill seekers and we don't need to ruin our national park beaches for that. They can go to any of our amusement parks for thrills. Please keep the tranquility of Cape Hatteras as is and keep off road vehicles out.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9912	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:04:09						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Let's make this simple. Leave natural areas natural. No driving on beaches, no drilling for oil ANYWHERE. Work with nature and develop renewable sources of energy that allow us to enjoy nature, not dominate and exploit it. Have you learned nothing from the most recent oil spill? What about the Exxon Valdez from 20 years ago? Those beaches are still full of oil.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9913	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Routh, Dedra C						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:04:29						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Vehicles are everywhere, please don't impact this beautiful seashore with yet...more vehicles. Our coast lines are fragile as is, so please stop this now!!!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9914	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	Hesse & Doug Dyer, Susanne						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:04:42						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please prevent off road vehicles from destroying our national parks and Cape Hatteras National Seashore in particular						

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9915	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Klemm, Jerry K					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:05:16					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9916	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:05:22					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I've been to Cape Hattaras twice. It is lovely. You should see what the ATV's have done to the parkland in Minnesota. It has wrecked a lot of forest areas. Don't let that happen to the Cape.					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9917	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b> Y
<b>Name:</b>	private					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:05:30					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>When looking at Off Road Vehicle Use in Cape Hatteras National Seashore, please choose Option D - that which is least intrusive to the number of species using the seashore as habitat and nesting grounds. The wildness of the place and it's use as habitat must be the first priority, not recreational use by humans.</p> <p>Thanks for giving me a chance to comment on this. I treasure all of our National Park units as places that protect our nation and our planet from overuse by human beings. I trust you will think of this when planning uses in the Cape hatteras National Seashore.</p>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9918	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Rinker, Robert					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:06:24					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe that off road vehicles and nature do not mix well. Thanks					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9919	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Parker, Donna					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:06:37					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The outer banks is a treasue to me and my family. It is one of the last places at the shore line that we can go and enjoy the natural beauty of the BEACH! Please don't allow vehicles to roam the beaches without restrictions! The shore line is for wildlife and for families like mine that don't take away from the pristine enviroment but enjoy it for a time. The beaches are for feet not tires! thank you, Donna Parker					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9920	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Chambers, Timothy B					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:08:12					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The problem has always been the following: off road vehicles EXCLUDE ALL PURSUITS BY OTHER USERS. Thank you, Tim Chambers					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9921	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	
<b>Name:</b>	Strijek, Claudia					
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 00:00:00					
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect</p>					

0011543

the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9922    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 20:08:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is critical that motorized traffic be strictly limited in all sensitive coastal regions which retain or can be restored to predominately natural status. Please see that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore area is protected in this way.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9923    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** pomerantz, fred  
**Received:** May.07,2010 20:08:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is impossible to create an ORV plan that will be adhered to scrupulously. The result will be irreversible damage on the dunes and elsewhere.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9924    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Reichardt, Dorothy M  
**Received:** May.07,2010 20:08:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think it is very wrong to allow off road vehicles in national parks. They are harmful to the landscape, to wildlife, and to the peace which people often seek in our parks and in nature. Certainly, they are apt to cause harm to the beach and seashore. People can ride these vehicles elsewhere.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9925    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 20:09:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please, no HOV in our parks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9926    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 20:09:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE work to keep off road vehicals ON THE DEVELOPED ROADS, where they belong. They have NO place in Cape Hatteras or any other wild, undeveloped area. We do need to develop ways for people who cannot hike long distances to visit these places. But ORVs are not the answer, they are destructive to these environments. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9927    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lilleleht, Lembit U  
**Received:** May.07,2010 20:10:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9928    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07,2010 20:10:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE! Protect our seashores from off-road vehicles. They are terrible and harm the environment and destroy habitat and peaceful enjoyment by our citizens.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9929    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Thrasher, Amber  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take

precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Please do not allow this devastation to natural habitat!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9930    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Mead, Maggie  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:10:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

What is the point of having national parks at all, if they are destined to only be turned into more roads? This plan would constitute extremely poor stewardship of our remaining natural spaces, and is not at all in keeping with the legacy of the national parks idea-that is, protecting America's natural beauty as a source of inspiration and wonder. The noise and visual disturbance of off-road vehicles ruin the experience to be had in a national park (while providing a good time to a very few), and, more importantly, devastate fragile wildlife habitats. Even if, perhaps, an ATV company is contributing funds to this plan, please just keep them out of our last wild spaces - a majority of us still cherish national parks as the only places left to experience being out of earshot of an engine.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9931    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:11:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9932    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:11:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9933    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:11:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9934    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations.  
Permitting ORV's in Cape Hatteras, will destroy the core of the reason that Cape Hatteras was established this pristine location as a treasure, that is to preserve it as a wilderness. To allow all future generations of Americans to observe, the natural state of an Atlantic seashore without being challenged, by motorized vehicles, and their noise, fumes, leaking oils and sometimes careless operators. Imagine the sea turtles and wildlife and flora and fauna that will be affected. We must leave this area pristine.  
I support all of America's national parks, but especially our sea shores. Cape Hatteras Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement give priority to ORV use over all other visitors. This approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Thank you for reading my comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9935    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a regular visitor to many of our magnificent National Parks, as well as an annual pass holder and annual donor, I am concerned to hear of the National Park Service plans to allow the destruction that increased off-road vehicle usage will mean to our Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9936    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:11:36  
**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:** 9937    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:11:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9938    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:11:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9939    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:11:37  
**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. National Parks should be for the enjoyment of all, but not at the expense of damaging or hurting wildlife, vegetation or habitats.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9940    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:11:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9941    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:11:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9942    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

I have seen loggerheads emerging from the sea to lay eggs at a beach where now, 40 years later, none remain to return. It was an unforgettable experience. We must protect these ancient creatures before they are entirely gone.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9943    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:11:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9944    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:11:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9945    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:11:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9946    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:11:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent

degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9947    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:11:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9948    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:11:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9949    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:12:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Recreational vehicles should not be allowed to run on the beaches which causes pollution, erosion, noise and destruction of coastal life zones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9950    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Strowd, Richard E  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing

an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely, Richard E. Strowd, JD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9951    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Rueppel, Kathleen  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:13:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** When will the selfish, self-centered people finally keep their gas-guzzling, noisy, annoying, destructive off-road toys off public lands and parks? It is time for those who have the power to make decisions in favor of the environment - for the animals, whose habitat is constantly shrinking, the plants that are all too often adversely affected by these vehicles and for those who wish to have at least ONE quiet, non-polluted place to go. The forested parks are infested with these off-road vehicles and now it's time for the beaches to be overrun.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9952    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Lenhart, Donna  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I submit the following comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches.  
All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors.  
Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9953    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:13:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles are destructive to fragile, natural environments that's why there should not be any off road vehicles allowed in the beautiful Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9954    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:14:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.  
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9955    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:14:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

\*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

\* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

\* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

With the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, it is extremely important that more of this beach is protected for birds during nesting and migration. A major feeding and resting spot will be lost if the oil reaches more of the lands along this immense area.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9956    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:15:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There needs to be a balance between conservation & recreation. Endangered species require these beaches as there is precious little habitat available to them. Piping plover chicks are roughly the size of a cotton ball & can become trapped in the tracks left by large SUV's unable to access the rack line for sustenance; let alone leaving them out in the open as prey. Please consider the resource first; there are many other beaches open to fishing & other forms of recreation. Please do not give in to the pressure to "grandfather" an outdated practice.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9957    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:15:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** we need to leave some of this beautiful land to nature and the endangered animals. Humans want to destroy everything!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9958    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, Denys  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:15:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please quit assaulting natural fragile land. Enough already!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9959    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Oggiono, Nanette  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."  
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
Sincerely,  
Nanette Oggiono nanykat@aol.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9960    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:16:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Save Cape Hatteras from off road vehicles

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9961    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Hobbs, Michael  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:16:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I frequently travel around the country birding. In fact, I just got back yesterday from Cape May, NJ. Cape Hatteras NS is exactly the kind of place I like to visit. But I can tell you that ORV use and birding DON'T MIX. In ORV areas, everything is trashed and there are very few birds. But even areas that are simply near to ORV sites, the birding experience is very negatively affected. When trying to find song birds, I rely almost 100% on my hearing. In Cape May, I found 20 species of warbler, but five of those were heard-only. Birders don't just find birds by ear, we identify them. Noise from ORV traffic prevents that. On the beach, you might just think there are a few gulls that are being chased off by the traffic. But for birders, they're not just a few gulls. I've traveled hundreds of miles from home to look for birds on the beach. Those gulls might comprise a half-dozen species, with a similar number of terns. Shorebirds may be present, resting or feeding on the beach. ORVers never even see them, probably. But the shorebirds flee in terror. It's also simply horrible from an environmental/ecological point of view. ORVs spread invasive weeds. They destroy nests of birds, turtles, and snakes. They disturb birds making migrations of thousands of miles (at the very limits of their endurance). They cause erosion. ORVs also create noise pollution, and have horribly smelly exhaust that is bad for birds and people. I urge you not to allow ORVs at all on the National Seashore. If you must allow them, please limit the areas they can use to an absolute minimum. At least 1-2% of the riders are complete assholes who will ignore all of your regulations. YOU SHOULD NOT ALLOW ORV USAGE WITHOUT PROVIDING FUNDING FOR A LARGE ENFORCEMENT STAFF. Enforcement should include large fines, not just warnings. Serious issues should be punishable by CONFISCATION OF THE ORV. Anything less will work for 90% percent of the riders. But the small minority can cause HUGE DAMAGE and HUGE DISRUPTION and should NOT BE TOLERATED. Too little enforcement is as good as saying "Go ahead and trash the place". THEY WILL.

Sincerely,  
Michael Hobbs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9962    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Furthermore, the Outer Banks, like most barrier island habitats, whether developed or not, are already at the mercy of the elements, swallowed up by the sea and constantly shifting. These islands are not meant to be permanent by any standard, however since we have built upon most of these islands for financial advantage we should minimize human impact. The beach and the dunes are the first line of coastal defense. By allowed off-road traffic onto these areas, beach vegetation, where and when present, will be decimated, allowing for wind and surf to penetrate the dunes more readily. This has already been achieved in the past during the few tropical storms, nor'easters and hurricanes that have struck the Outer Banks, often punching through already weakened dunes to NC 12 in several spots and every few decades or so, even through the entire island, creating a new inlet. Human-induced damage should be kept to an absolute minimum. Several parking areas and other access points already exist. Increasing human foot traffic is bad enough - off-road vehicles would herald a true disaster.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9963    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Carroll, Thomas  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:18:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9964    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Benjamin, Patricia

**Received:** May,07,2010 20:18:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to encourage you to protect the wildlife and non-motorized recreation values of the Outer Banks. I visit the Cape Hatteras area every few years with my family. The last thing we want to experience is a bunch of noisy, polluting vehicles cruising up and down, crushing everything in sight. That's what highways are for, and it should not be the dominant use of NPS-administered natural areas. I encourage you to severely restrict the use of ORVs in Cape Hatteras.

**Correspondence ID:** 9965    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** N/A, N/A

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

**Correspondence ID:** 9966    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Cervoni, Toni

**Received:** May,07,2010 20:20:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Air pollution and the intolerable noise pollution those idiotic machines tend to make. Most of these vehicle drivers are haphazardly making their way through unknown territory making this trip a danger to those unaware that this may be the day their legs will be knocked out from under them. Not fair-you got that right. Vehicular murder just waiting to happen. These beautiful once quiet terrains need to remain to those on foot including the wildlife. Let's not disturb what has worked for so many years.

**Correspondence ID:** 9967    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.  
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."  
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.  
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.  
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.  
\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely,

**Correspondence ID:** 9968    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 20:23:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore sure does not need off the road vehicle's. I personally have visited this beautiful site, to have a loud destructive machine tear up the seashore is just crazy. We are destroying our planet at a very rapid rate, all for the almighty buck \$\$\$\$\$\$. Wake up America before it is to late.

**Correspondence ID:** 9969    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Carroll, Mark T

**Received:** May,07,2010 20:23:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please make sure that the beach, it's wildlife and it's serenity are protected. Please limit the use of ORV at this beautiful place.

**Correspondence ID:** 9970    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** May,07,2010 20:23:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The thought of approving an Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore is an appallingly wrong move. Off Road Vehicles don't belong on beaches, especially those that belong to wildlife and pedestrians. I'm surprised that such a plan is even being considered. We need to think more about strolling pedestrians, who deserve to walk safely (and noiselessly--except for shore birds' songs and waves' rushing sounds). More important is our wildlife, especially endangered sea turtles and shorebirds. I've worked with Earthwatch, protecting leatherback turtles on St. Croix. It was an amazing, eye-opening experience to see how hard our sea turtles struggle to survive and generate new young turtles, who also are challenged to make their way back to the sea. These animals work against many odds already: increasing lights along shores, from new developments; predators; simple "nature's problems." Can you imagine what ORV access will do to these endangered creatures?  
Opening Cape Hatteras National Seashore to ORVs will spell disaster . . . in capital letters.

**Correspondence ID:** 9971    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y



**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the Lawrence Brook Watershed Partnership and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Sincerely,

Michael Shakarjian 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 9972    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Shepherd, Wayne  
**Received:** May.07.2010 20:25:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Decision Maker: Your preferred plan for managing ORV traffic on Cape Hatteras National Seashore falls far short of protecting resources,

including nests and habitat of sea turtles and waterbirds. I urge you to take the following into account when deciding which course to take with the final management plan:

1. Limiting or restricting ORV traffic on 16 miles of the 68-mile seashore is totally inadequate! In my opinion, you have the allocation backward. ORV's should be allowed on only 16 miles of the seashore, with the remainder protected against such traffic.
2. Far more visitors to the national seashore want to simply go and play the beach in settings where their solitude and safety is not compromised by dune buggies and other ORV's.
3. Instead of allowing such an unbalanced amount of ORV traffic, please develop more parking areas along the main road along with trails over the dunes accessing the beach front areas for park visitors.
4. Please give wildlife and non-motorized use of the beach areas much more consideration. As I said, non-motorized users of the seashore account for far more visitors than the ORV users. And fishermen do not have to drive their ORVs on the seashore to fish from the surf.
5. Please protect our precious wildlife habitat and keep ORV traffic off most of the seashore property.

Thank you for taking time to read my comments. I am a native of North Carolina who has visited Cape Hatteras a number of times, and wish to be informed of your decision in this matter.

Sincerely, Wayne Shepherd

**Correspondence ID:** 9973    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 20:27:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I lived in Florida, where some beaches allow vehicles and some do not, for many years. Problems with vehicles: Once cars get onto the beach,

irresponsible people drive where/when they are not supposed to go -- they kill dune grasses and run over bird's nests and turtles. It's pretty difficult to stop them. Kids drink at the beach and get careless or drive too fast; they run over other people sleeping or lying on the beach. Driving on the beach is noisy, intrusive, completely destroys the experience of nature for other visitors and creates huge headaches for law enforcement. And once you start allowing this, it is very difficult to stop.

**Correspondence ID:** 9974    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May.07.2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and an ARDENT supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally SIGNIFICANT resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I wholeheartedly support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service CANNOT ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to PROTECT the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must 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 thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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!

0011555

Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!  
Sincerely, K.K.Robertshaw

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9975	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Reeve, Donna				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:28:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I know the quiet of the Outer Banks. I know the rough surf, the sea oats on the dunes, and the majestic lighthouse. I've been four-wheeling on the sandy roads leading out to the beach's fishing spots. Don't left off road vehicles ruin this unspoiled piece of paradise.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9976	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Patterson, Dale P				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:29:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I see no need to turn the beaches of Cape Hatteras into a parking lot or off road race track... so don't!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9977	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:29:06						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dune buggies and such ruin the land and are noisy						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9978	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Donahue, Meredith				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:30:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9979	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Peters, Bruce				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:30:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Our family has nearly been hit by careless/aggressive motorists driving on the beach as we have walked in the sand. Also, off road vehicles are devastating to wildlife and their young. Many endangered species, turtles in particular, nest on the beach. Off road vehicles crush the fragile shells, ensuring that the young will not hatch. Those young that are not killed before birth are killed on the beach by the crushing weight of the vehicle. The solution is simple: keep vehicles off of the beach. Walking is good for predominately obese America and for the fragile ecosystems we threaten or destroy with our thoughtless conduct. One of the purposes of the National Park Service is to protect wildlands and its inhabitants, which is impossible to do when the beaches are treated like off road driving courses. Thank you for banning vehicles from National Park Service beaches.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9980	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	N/A, N/A				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:30:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Let us not destroy such precious treasure and protection. There are consequences to each footprint, let alone tire track, on a sand configuration. Surely we are more intelligent than to permit such destruction.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9981	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	32596
<b>Name:</b>	Laiski, Caleb				
<b>Received:</b>	May,07,2010 20:31:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D,				

if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9982    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Troup, Brenda P  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:31:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore would render it unpleasant to the point of being unusable for hikers, swimmers, bird watchers, recreational fishermen, and especially children. Those vehicles are loud and destructive, and often driven recklessly, so are a danger to people and animals. They add nothing to what should be a natural, undeveloped, preserve suitable for nesting birds and turtles and passive recreation. I am a member of the National Parks Conservation Association, and know the intent of the Parks; to protect special places from destruction so future generations can experience them in a pristine state.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9983    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:31:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Keep all shoreline wildlife and habitats free from intrusion, harassment, vandalism and blatant sabotage from offensive ORV users. A tram system of sorts operated by the National Parks should be implemented in order to prevent a vehicular mob scene along Cape Hatteras beautiful shoreline. A special tram-system that can be designed to handle a large influx of visitors of all sorts can be one solution.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9984    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:33:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I completely support the NPS preferred alternative in this matter. The NPS plan is a well thought out, balanced approach to providing a range of access opportunities to the public while balancing resource protection and preservation. It is critical that we manage public lands in a balanced manner so that within the bounds of appropriate protection/preservation we allow the public to enjoy the use of our park units so that we retain their support thus ensuring their preservation in perpetuity. Thankyou.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9985    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:33:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9986    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:35:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,  
As a member of the League of Women Voters and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all

0011557

visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,  
Charlotte Pirch

**Correspondence ID:** 9987    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

\*\*\*\*\* Thank you very much for taking the time to protect one of America's most beautiful stretches of Atlantic seashore! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and generations to come will be grateful for your action today. Thanks again!

I worked for the NPS for 7 seasons and I understand that the mandate to protect while allowing for enjoyment often appears to be inherently difficult. However, people can enjoy Cape Hatteras without all of the OHV access and traffic.

Sincerely,  
Brian R. Holmes

**Correspondence ID:** 9988    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:36:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** National Parks are about preserving vital and special lands and waters for future generations and the sustainable health of those places. Allowing such a place to become an off-road park is not in that interest. For the sake of those who wish to appreciate the land, not tear it to shreds, and for the sake of the species that make up an important ecosystem in the area, please do not doom the land to ORV's. Keep the standard that distinguishes National Parks and preserves the beauty that they all hold. Don't let this place waste and degrade under the oversized tires and diesel engines. Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 9989    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:36:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not let off-road vehicles tear up our shorelines, especially on Cape Hatteras. We need to save what little beachfront we have which is rapidly being worn away by hurricanes, erosion, & just plain too many people using them.

**Correspondence ID:** 9990    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Young, William T  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:37:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

0011558

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must 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) There is too much land in the National Parks, Monuments & Seashores that is not kept for wildlife to survive. Allowing ORV use does not help this at all.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9991    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Novick, Colin M

**Received:** May,07,2010 20:37:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a conservationist, a park user, and a recreation land manager I wish to weigh in on the Draft ORV management plan.

In my personal experience, wildlife habitat, particularly in more sensitive environments, is incompatible with practically any ORV use. Furthermore, passive recreation, with its focus on observing and engaging the natural environment similarly is completely disrupted by ORV use making the user experience either frustrating or negative.

I am not sure to what extent Cape Hatteras NS uses volunteers to do maintenance and management tasks, but I speak from experience when I say that several hours of inappropriate ORV use can take hundreds if not thousands of volunteer man/hours to rectify. Seeing as the National Park Service has not enjoyed a constant and strong fiscal support from Congress over the decades it may be useful to base management decisions at least in part based on what corrective actions can be undertaken with a minimal use of labor be that employed, contracted, or volunteer.

Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns and personal experiences as it relates to conservation land management and ORV use and for considering how ORV use applies to the Cape Hatteras NS.

Most Sincerely,

Colin M.J. Novick

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9992    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** robinson, richard m

**Received:** May,07,2010 20:38:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9993    **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 supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. I can tell you from personal experience that this seashore is one of the best to vacation at if you are looking to get away from it all and have a quiet, peaceful, relaxing, natural area to take your family too.

All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9994    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596

**Name:** Filigenzi, John J

**Received:** May,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

In looking at ORV percentages for Alternatives D (favored by the NPCA) and Alternative F (favored by the NPS) I calculated that "D" provides 40% of the Cape Hatteras NS to ORV traffic. "E" on the other hand provides at times over 76% of this ocean jewel to ORV traffic. The 40% yearly figure specified in "D" should be more than enough for ORVs.

As a frequent visitor to Hatteras it would be unfortunate for it to become the Daytona Beach of NC. I also go to Assateque NS frequently and the amount of Island offered for ORV traffic is huge. You reach a point on the beach where it looks like a road as been driven in the sand over the dunes. You look up and see vehicles as far as the eye can see ? not necessary. These beaches should be for nature not vehicle traffic. The 40% with option D is good and should be approved.

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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 John Filigenzi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9995    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** N/A, M S  
**Received:** May.07,2010 20:39:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is important people and animals alike be able to enjoy the beauty of nature without interference. Please protect Cape Hatteras from off road vehicles. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9996    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Corriere, Caryn L  
**Received:** May.07,2010 20:40:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
- 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
- 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9997    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Cooke, Katherine  
**Received:** May.07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

You're probably going to get a bunch of these letters. Before I just copy the note from the NPCA, I wanted to share that I am a North Carolina native now living in Brooklyn NY. My family and I travel every summer home to the outer banks of North Carolina for vacation. We spend thousands of dollars while we're there, visiting the National Seashore, climbing the light houses, taking the ferries, eating in local restaurants, renting homes and appreciating the beauty of the sea shore WITHOUT vehicles other than the beach patrol. We purchase fishing licenses, visit monuments, and take in the beautiful scenery. One of the most special parts is being able to go where the cars can't go, and no ORV's either.

The thought of having dune buggies leaving trenches from their tires through bird and turtle sanctuaries is beyond heartbreaking. This land was intended as a conservancy, not a multi-use area. There are ENOUGH places for gas powered monsters. Keep them out of the Hatteras national seashore, PLEASE.

ORV's pack the sand, damaging the delicate balance of the seashore. They are noisy, they disturb the peace of beach combers and birders, bother families with children who have to worry about a child darting in front of a car, and are just a bad idea. Keep cars of any variety -ORV, humvee, whatever it is - on paved roads and off the beach.

If ORV's are allowed to be on the seashore in any significant capacity, we'll be very sadly taking our dollars elsewhere.

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird

watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."

Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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 yours,  
Katherine Cooke

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9998    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596  
**Name:** Skotnicki, Rives  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:40:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** For several years our family has visited the Atlantic coast. Every year we see increasing evidence of a once beautiful seaside's desecration by jet skis, atvs and pollution. In view of the latest disaster in the Gulf of Mexico, how could anyone wish to allow the noise and air pollution from such vehicles. Please leave nature and wildlife alone. Is ther eno place that can be sacred?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9999    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:41:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 10000    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 32596    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** May,07,2010 20:41:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.  
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:  
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.  
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.  
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

---